The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

THE Korean situation continues to demand courage, persistence and patience. It is easy to tire of a stalemate, deliberately contrived, which, however, may at any moment break down into heavy fighting. The prolonged acrimonious discussion about the prisoners of war has been complicated by administrative mistakes. But what is at stake is the prestige of the West and the authority of the United Nations, and in these is involved the future of Asia. The one good feature of a sombre situation is that neither China nor Russia is disposed for a declared war against the United Nations, but since we are dealing with men willing to sacrifice a whole generation in the struggle for the control of a continent the outcome remains uncertain. Any failure of nerve, of which some observers profess to see signs, would have very grave consequences. The troops from whom so much is demanded and on whom so much depends must be supported in every way possible, not least by the knowledge that they are fighting in a cause as vital to the future as was the war against the Nazi tyranny.

* * *

In Europe the agreement signed at Bonn can be regarded as an indispensible step towards European unity. In Germany, however, Dr. Adenauer is not without his critics among those who believe that Russia intends to partition Germany, either permanently or until Germany is able to negotiate for the return of the Eastern Zone. A rearmed Germany, so the argument runs, will put power into the hands of military men, who will appeal to the country on the plea that they alone will be able to recover the lost provinces. They know the West does not need them while Russia will, as she has done before. The elements of a bargain will be there.

* * *

No visitor to Germany can fail to observe the dominance of the problem of the Eastern Zone. There is, of course, the loss of territory, population and economic power; there is the deep wound to national pride; and there are the refugees, estimated at some ten millions, with a steady stream, rising with every fresh crisis, mostly of young men and women escaping from Soviet slavery into the West. They leave their homes and families, crowding

into an already overcrowded labour market. They are of the age to be learning the skill and discipline of work. In a year or two they will have learnt only how to live in a society that cannot offer them work. Some of them will sell their souls as well as their bodies where they can find a market. This is primarily a German problem, but it may well have consequences for all Europe. Democracy in Germany is an idea, not yet a practice, and it is an idea which is associated in their recent history with the Weimar Republic, widespread unemployment and economic collapse. The people are now required to learn a new technique of responsible government, not with the leisure of decades for trial and error, but under the pressure of events hurrying them whither they do not know.

* * *

A deputation of Congregational ministers and laymen from this country recently visited the Protestant Church of the Palatinate under the auspices of the International Congregational Council for an exchange of greetings and to develop a Christian fellowship which it is hoped will enrich the spiritual life of the British and German churches. A similar visit of laymen has taken place to Hamburg and Schleswig-Holstein. The Church of the Palatinate is a union of Reformed and Lutheran churches and includes rather more than half the population. The lesser half is, of course, Roman Catholic. Until the kingdom was abolished in 1918 the King of Bavaria was the head of the Church, even when he was a Roman Catholic. The Church now has an elected President. We hope to publish in a later number an article on the Palatinate Church by Professor Schneider, a distinguished historian and New Testament scholar, who having resigned his chair in the university of Königsberg (in the Eastern Zone) is now teaching in Speyer, the ancient capital of the Palatinate.

* * *

The delegation was received most warmly by the administrative leaders, who opened their hearts and minds to us in conference and in conversation, and by the ministers and people in the parishes of industrial towns like Ludwigshaven and villages in the rich vineyards of the Rhine Valley. We learnt something of their history and church order; of their theology and social work; of their relations with the State and with the French Protestant churches; of their work with men, women and young people; of their hopes and fears; and above all of their enduring faith in Jesus Christ. We attended an ecumenical service in Speyer on Ascension Day at which we heard three sermons in succession from the President, one of our own number, and a French minister. We attended service in a village with the whole population in the congregation. We were present at a great demonstration of young

people making their Christian witness in impressive numbers and with impressive seriousness, and we spent some days scattered throughout the Palatinate, meeting ministers and people in their homes and joining with them at the Lord's table, receiving and administering the Holy Communion. The Speaker of the Federal German Parliament, who was himself attending the Young People's demonstration at Landau, honoured us with a meeting at which he spoke to us of some of Germany's most pressing problems and of his own hopes of what the Church and its youth can do for Germany and Europe. We on the other side were most respectfully heard when we tried to explain what seemed to them the reluctance of this country to identify ourselves with the measures necessary for a united Europe, and when we suggested that the only foundation for an effectual union was the reconciliation of France and Germany for which a great measure of responsibility must rest upon themselves.

* * *

Before we left, being asked to sum up the impressions of our visit, we were able to say, You are the same kind of people as we are. We are the same kind of people as you are. Our fellowship together has been easy, rich and we believe it may be fruitful. Your work lies near the very heart of Europe: our responsibilities are more scattered. We can help one another by each being faithful to the calling whereunto we are called. Each of us will be stronger for our fellowship with the other.

Our talk together, both formal and informal, being always friendly, could often be frank, and this was especially helpful when our theological discussions brought us within reach of recent history and present conditions. On hearing something of their tumultuous history since the Reformation we realized afresh how far we are all conditioned by our inheritance, and that many of our virtues have been won for us and so carry responsibilities we so easily forget. We discussed the initiative that is implied in our Christian freedom, and did not shrink from trying to apply it to the politics of Europe. Nor could we talk of these things with a man of fifty, who thrice has lost everything he possessed and begun again with faith and cheerful courage, and be left unmoved when he declared that there were many like himself who looked to Britain for the moral leadership which alone can restore hope to Europe. To the suggestion that there were signs of a loss of nerve among us he replied that if that were true he believed a new dark age would fall. We stood on a hilltop in the Vosges and looked over to the French frontier: behind us in the east we knew there was now another frontier ominously near. If our theology and philosophy take no account of these things we shall have failed our generation.

Bishop Stephen Neill has written a book which will be read with great interest by those who are deeply concerned with the work of the World Council of Churches, and ought to be read with even greater interest by those whose sympathies are but ill-informed or not awakened. The World Council met in assembly at Amsterdam in 1948 and is to meet at Evanston, U.S.A., in 1954. We have thus had four years to think about what was said and done at Amsterdam and two years to prepare for what ought to be said and done at Evanston. *Christian Partnership* (S.C.M. Press, 7s. 6d.) puts the present phase of the Ecumenical Movement in historical perspective and sets forth the formidable difficulties which have still to be overcome. His many years of distinguished work in the negotiations which led to the inauguration of the Church of South India and latterly in the secretariat of the World Council enable Bishop Neill, without disguising his own sympathies, to understand and present the attitudes and convictions of those who differ from him. His lifelong devotion to the cause of unity never misleads him into those short cuts which in committee often seem so helpful and in fact invariably prove so useless.

* * *

The Ecumenical Movement has been boldly described as the most evident operation of the Holy Spirit in our time. But we who in our presumption would look upon the face of God are like Moses placed in a cleft of the rock and permitted to see Him only when He has passed by. It is yet too soon to appraise the advance that we all pray is being made towards the *Una Sancta*. Indeed it is only slowly that the circle of discourse, where the urgency and the difficulties of an adequate and sufficiently comprehensive expression of one faith in one Church, is widened from the leaders in their committees and conferences to the people in whose name things are either done or not done.

* * *

The Assembly of the World Council made a very great impression throughout the world. The declaration of the Assembly, 'We intend to stay together', expressed the belief as well as the hope that a new stage had been reached in the life of the Protestant Churches of the world. The world is tragically, dangerously divided. The needs of men, spiritual and practical, keep no frontiers. A united Church would be heard, if it could speak, in the hearts of men where desolation and fear are only one remove from despair. There are urgent problems in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, that are the concern of all the Churches, but which none alone can hope to meet. Evangelical work in many parts of the world is confronted with a new nationalism which demands a new attitude towards the 'younger' Churches and is

impatient of denominational differences that seem to them to be rooted less in differing interpretations of the Gospel than in European history.

* * *

To begin with it is necessary to remember that to speak of an Ecumenical Movement is to state a hope rather than a fact. The Roman Catholic Church was not represented either officially or unofficially at Amsterdam, and the membership of the Orthodox Church depends upon the recognition by others that they claim to be the one and only true Church of Christ, having a monopoly of grace and of the sacraments. On this, Bishop Neill writes, "To an Anglican who believes that the Church of England is the orthodox, catholic and Apostolic Church in England, who has not the smallest doubt about the validity of Anglican ordinations and consecrations, who has shared in the life of the daughter Churches of the Anglican Communion . . . the suggestion that the Anglican Churches have neither grace nor sacraments is so ludicrous as to approach very close to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. Yet, meeting in ecumenical fellowship, he must be willing to listen while Orthodox brethren tell him he has never really received the Holy Communion in his life, and that the only hope for him is to return to the fellowship of the true Church, in which the grace of Christ is guaranteed to the faithful."

In so speaking, he speaks for others as well as Anglicans; and indeed, for some others about some Anglicans.

* * *

The Anglican view is less easily defined. The Lambeth Conference of 1920 stated that the Anglican Churches accept all who have been baptized with water in the name of the Holy Trinity as being members of one Holy Catholic Church. On the status of "certain Christian bodies", however, the Anglican point of view is less definite and less unanimous. "Evidence is steadily accumulating", says the Bishop, "to show that in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Church of Enland did not unchurch the Continental Churches, and was prepared to recognize that the lack of episcopacy alone did not disqualify a Christian body from being accounted a Church. In recent years a stricter view, according to which non-episcopal groups should be considered societies rather than Churches, has made considerable headway within the Church of England".

* * *

The difficulties of maintaining an ecumenical fellowship are thus very real. Time alone will show whether it can be done usefully or, indeed, at all. Bishop Neill suggests five conditions that must be fulfilled. (1) Every Church and every member of each Church

must feel free to hold his own views. (2) Every member must have the fullest liberty to express his views, speaking the truth, as he understands it, in love. (3) Every Church must have liberty to try to persuade others of the rightness of its own views and practices. (4) No Church must try to impose its ways or beliefs on any other. (5) Every Church and every member must be willing to learn from all the rest.

Such are the conditions of the new fellowship. They present little difficulty to Free Churchmen, who in general unchurch none who manifests the spirit of Christ. Those who have the spirit of Christ, they are His. The rest we leave to the individual conscience and to God, believing that he who asks will receive, who seeks will find, and to him that knocks it will be opened. If the fellowship of such is not a Church, we do not know what is. If it has the marks of the Spirit, what does it matter that some temporary fashion of thought denies it the name?

* * *

The last chapter of the book is headed "A Dangerous Experiment: The Church of South India". It is an unexpected adjective. And it is surely something more than an experiment. About a million Christians who before 1947 were distinguished as Anglicans, Congregationalists, Methodists and Presbyterians, by the inauguration of the new Church, became members of the Church of South India. That such a union should be pure gain with no appearance of loss was not to be expected. To the majority of those concerned the gains outweighed the loss. But, more importantly, they assured themselves and one another that they were being led by the Holy Spirit. Are they to be trusted? If not, who is? It is true that many heretics and eccentrics have believed themselves led by the Holy Spirit into all kinds of absurdities and errors. But the absurdities and the errors have revealed themselves for what they were. They were known by their fruits. So will the South India Church be known. And so will all of us.

* * *

The Union in South India has acted in some degree as a catalytic agent upon much thinking in this country about Church order. In the light of the official attitude of the Anglican Church towards it, it is not easy to understand the suggestion of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Free Churches "to take episcopacy into their systems" in the interests of reunion. The Church of South India has certainly done that, but its episcopacy is not in accordance with the conception of Apostolic succession as that is at present understood in the Anglican Church. Bishop Neill points out that the Anglican Churches have never entered into defined relationship with another Church, unless they have been assured that it both

holds the essentials of the Christian faith, and also has an unbroken episcopal succession, as a mark of continuity with the Church of the Apostles and with the great historic Churches of Christendom.

* * *

The union which is expressed in the World Council is thus not a union of Churches in communion with one another. But that is not the only kind of union. Men who live and die in this world need the grace of God; nations and communities of men need the law of God, His mercy and His righteousness. Those who are called to minister to their fellow men in these things need one another, for none can do God's work alone. The friends of Jesus Christ, by whatever name they call themselves or are called by others, desire only to present Him to mankind in His power and His love. There is an immense variety in this work, and the mark of a disciple is that in his own place and time he does the work of his Lord. Precise definitions here are as unnecessary as they are impossible. There was once a discussion at a famous London political club as to the qualifications of membership. Some demanded allegiance to Cephas and some to Apollos. The discussion was closed by an eminent legal member of the committee who said, "The qualification for membership of this club is the willingness and ability to pay three guineas a year".

* * *

Church order is not the only sphere in which an essential spiritual unity can find expression. The Church of Christ in the world is not only to be thought of as an ecclesiastical organization. There is indeed a unity which distinguishes so many of us in different societies as Protestant Christians, called as we believe in humility and hope, to do the work of our Lord. That unity will be deepened and strengthened as we find expression for it. We need one another in order to maintain and extend those precious values which come to us in the Gospel without which the life of man in this world is empty and poor. We need one another in order that the work we know needs to be done shall be done better. But let it be understood that for the present, and probably for some time to come, the expression of our unity will not be found in terms of Church order. But that does not exhaust the possibilities. If as we all believe it is the will of God that we should be one in Christ, and if no one Church order satisfies the consciences of all sincere believers, may it not be that Church order has been allowed to occupy a greater place in our minds than it ought? It is bold even to the point of arrogance to suggest that the Holy Spirit works in the life of mankind only through one type of ecclesiastical organization, and that if all the bishops who are considered to be in the Apostolic succession perished in some great persecution or

cataclysm, the operation of God's grace would cease in the world. Bishop Neill suggests at one point that even theologians need to be told when they are talking nonsense!

* * *

How versatile a scholar is the Principal of Mansfield College, and with what clarity and grace he writes! In his new book, *Law and the Laws: Being the Marginal Comments of a Theologian* (Green & Son, Edinburgh, and Sweet & Maxwell, London, pp. 115, 15s.), his theme is the mutual relations between theology, moral philosophy and jurisprudence, but especially between the first and the last of these great studies. It will be discussed elsewhere, no doubt, by men learned in the law, but let one general reader say with what pleasure and profit he has read it. "One fundamental aspect of any civiliation is law: another is religion, and the two must be fruitfully related". The confusion, even the despair, which has befallen the modern world are consequences of the separation between these two in a society that rejects all final and ultimate standards. Western civilization developed in a society which recognized that relations existed between the moral realities, which men perceived, or believed themselves to perceive, and their conduct as individuals and communities. If these relations are denied or ignored then the conduct of men is guided by no surer guide than expediency. Dr. Micklem is less concerned with the disregard of the philosophers for Christian ethics than with the drift away from its foundations in the law of God, which marks the modern development of the laws of communities and States. He anticipates the protests of the lawyers (for whom the book is chiefly meant) who may be tempted to say that responsibility for social and political conditions is outside their sphere of duty, and of the religious people who reveal a constant tendency to suppose that religion deals only with ideal values, that it is contaminated and secularized if it is brought into relation with the workaday world of compromise and unideal organization. Neither of these protests is valid, for law cannot be divorced from justice without disastrous consequences, as we have seen in recent years in Europe, nor religion from the life of the people in their communal and national relationships. The philosophical idealism dominant in Germany during the nineteenth century had its consequences in the twentieth. Reputable people did not attend political meetings. Politics was dirty. So grew up a horrifying but perfectly legal tyranny, of which the German people were first the victims and then the instruments.

Notwithstanding his plea that he is not learned in the law, Dr. Micklem is familiar with its weightier matters, but his purpose is chiefly to call attention to an area of intellectual and moral reconstruction that has been perilously neglected, and to call for the

restoration of religion to its proper place in the life of civilized man if he is to remain civilized.

Religious people, moralists and lawyers have wider responsibilities than are contained within their several fields of special knowledge and interest. It is right and necessary that each field should be carefully cultivated, but they are related because each makes its contribution to the whole of which it is a part. But in fact law has developed away from its origins in ethics, and philosophy become less concerned with religion. But the authority of law depends upon its being the practical social expression of justice. Religion, too, is concerned with justice, not as an abstraction, but as related to the actual life of man in the world.

A chapter is given to the Classical Tradition and two to the Medieval Construction, in which the great jurists, who were also Christian theologians, worked over the Roman philosophy of law in the light of their reading of the Christian scriptures. They distinguished 'eternal law', which is the essential principal of God's Providence, the *jus gentium,* which is the law of nations, and 'positive law', which is particularly concerned with the conduct of men in communities. In modern times the first of these conceptions has largely been abandoned and, in practice, the second also, so that the modern world is struggling along trying to hold together, and in relation to one another, vast communities with man-made laws having no foundation except custom, convenience and, in varying degrees, the will of the ruler. During recent years attempts have been made under the pressure of great offences to recover the conception of the *jus gentium,* of which international law is the present expression. But, as Dr. Micklem observes, many of these offences brought to judgment at the Nuremburg War trials were committed by leaders of a people that had been regarded as one of the main sources of Christian enlightenment. Mass murder and the revival of slavery are among the lamentable facts of the modern world. To say that they are legal according to the positive law of any sovereign State is to acknowledge some of the consequences of divorcing such law from deeper and more universal conceptions of man's relationship to his fellows and the world he inhabits. Law without justice is transitory at the best: at the worst it can be very evil.

The consequences of religious, moral and legal isolationism are already grave and may be fatal. This book will do something to stop the rot.

* * *

Heard in Germany: One Englishman, a pipe; two Englishmen, a club; three Englishmen, a colony. One American, a dollar; two Americans, a bank; three Americans, a trust. One German, a soldier; two Germans, a parade; three Germans, a war.

SIMONE WEIL: A STUDY

By Melville Channing-Pearce, M.A.

(1)

Simone Weil is not only one of the most significant, she is also one of the most representative figures of our day. Her life, thought and faith—they are a seamless garment—speak to the condition of modern man at every point with which he is most concerned. Her bold and brilliant mind, her indomitable spirit and her passionate compassion probe to the quick of all our most present questions—of the conflict between the totalitarian and the libertarian life-attitudes, of social justice, of the mystery of *rapport* or real relationship with 'the Other', of the misery of the modern displaced and disestablished multitudes, of the endemic sense of dread, guilt and nihilism, of the hollowness and absurdity of modern man and existence, of the collapse of faith and the blind craving for some *mystique* able to fill the void. All these urgent issues of our 'age of anxiety' were her own; with all of them she engaged and to all of them, after an arduous travail of mind and spirit, she found her answers.

Hers were no slick or academic answers. What she preached she practised and it is no hyperbole to affirm that she laid down her life for the faith which she had found. That faith—a faith, in Peguy's phrase, *'arraché du ventre'*—culminated in a revolutionary yet traditional re-conception of Christianity. But it was no faith 'bombinating in the void in vain'; it was a lived experience. In the course of her intense but brief life she gave to our distracted and faithless age that which, for her, as for many of its most profound critics, seems its prime need—the example of a new type of secular sanctity. Upon all these counts and from all these aspects hers is a figure and a faith which cannot be ignored.

Since her life and her faith were so close-knit, they should be considered in conjunction. Unfortunately little more than the bare outline of her life and but little of its detail have yet been divulged. But that little is sufficient to show how indivisible are her faith and her life.

She came of a French agnostic and cultured *bourgeois* family. By race she was a Jewess. In both respects she reacted violently against her background. Under the leadership of a brilliant elder brother, her marked intellectual ability flowered early. In 1924, at the age of fifteen, she gained her *baccalaureat ès lettres* with distinction. At the Sorbonne she worked under the distinguished French philosopher, Emile Chartier, who, under the pseudonym

of 'Alain', had a strong influence upon her generation and recognized in her an unusual philosophical ability. The studies which most affected her mind and thought seem to have been those of Greek philosophy and mathematics. In 1931, she qualified from the Ecole Normale Supérieure at Paris as a teacher in philosophy. She thus began life as a cultured and somewhat *déracinée* intellectual with leanings to the Left.

She began her teaching career with an appointment at a girls' school at Puy where she remained until 1932. But she was already showing an active and, more than theoretic, a practical sympathy with the unemployed working classes which led her to break stones with them upon the roads and to limit her food to their scanty fare, and brought her into conflict with the municipal authorities. She was also already in touch with the group whose organ was the Review *Révolution Prolétarienne* for which she herself wrote.

The mystery of what she termed *'malheur'*—affliction, misery, dereliction—had, from the first, seized both her heart and mind. Her obsession with this problem was dictated by more than her profound compassion for the poor and wretched; the enigma of *'malheur'* also confronted her mind with the most profound of metaphysical problems. For in such *'malheur'* she divined not only the most characteristic feature of human existence in 'this world' but also, when realized and accepted, the way to a divine love of which she was no less conscious—a way which she presently perceived perfected in the Cross. Here, for her, was 'the Worst' in human existence, and from the first, she accepted Thomas Hardy's challenge to 'take a full look at the Worst'. But she was not content merely to look; she set herself to learn and to live this *'malheur'*.

After filling other teaching posts at Auxerre and Roanne, in 1933 she took a year's leave in order to experience in person the full rigour of working class existence. She worked on the land in the Jura and in the Renault factories. It was then and in the following years, when she was between the ages of 23 and 27, that she wrote the journals, letters and papers which have since been collected and published under the title of *La Condition Ouvrière*. The book contains not only her personal and very vivid day-to-day experience of the *'malheur'* of the life of a factory hand but also, in her correspondence with a factory-director and various papers, her very realistic and expert suggestions for its amelioration based upon her own knowledge of both normal life in a modern factory and of the great strike which, in 1936, paralysed the industrial life of northern France.

In the same year she attached herself to the Republican forces at Barcelona in order to participate personally in the Spanish Civil

War, and once again to experience *'malheur'* in a different and even more extreme form. Although her sympathies were, as in the industrial dispute, with the Left Wing, her chief concern here, too, seems to have been rather sociological than political. The rigours to which she had subjected herself previously and under war conditions were already sapping her strength and an accident at the front terminated her war service.

After a period of sick leave she resumed her teaching career at St. Quentin but, in 1938, was again incapacitated by ill-health. In 1940, after the fall of France, she settled in Marseilles. It was during these years, from 1936 to 1940—years of acute crisis in her world—that her own religious crisis culminated in her conversion to a fully Incarnational but not, in the Roman sense, orthodox Christianity.

The term 'conversion' is, however, inapt to describe a process which seems rather to have been that of the consummation of a life-attitude implicit in her nature and her previous thought and writings which were already Christian in grain if not in name. As she herself said, her's was an *anima naturaliter Christiana;* it was only a step, albeit in the dark, from her previous intuitions into the mystery, on the one hand, of the *'malheur'*, and, on the other, of the love and beauty latent in our life, by way of that devout and disciplined contemplation which she termed *'attente'*; to the recognition that, in the faith and Person of Christ, they found their full form, particularity and personality. These intimations had long been moving to that flash-point and her 'conversion' was thus rather a fulfilment than a revolution in her life.

That inner crisis culminated in 1937 and 1938 at the moment when the crisis of the West was also coming to a head. In 1937 she had visited Italy and spent what she described as 'two marvellous days' at Assisi visiting the shrine of that saint so congenial to her mood and mind, St. Francis. There, so she wrote, 'something stronger than myself compelled me for the first time in my life to go down on my knees'. In 1938 she visited Solêsmes where she met a young English Catholic whose 'truly angelic radiance' after Communion gave her, in her own words, 'for the first time the notion of a supernatural virtue in the Sacraments'. But he gave her more; he introduced her to the English metaphysical poets of the seventeenth century and, in particular, to George Herbert's poem, 'Love bade me welcome,' which so impressed her that she learned it by heart and formed the habit of reciting it with all the *'attente'* of which she was capable as a religious exercise.

It was during one of these recitations that, as she afterwards told her friend, Fr. Perrin, 'Christ Himself came down and took'

her. It was also at this time that, listening to Gregorian chants, she found a 'pure and perfect joy' in their 'unimaginable beauty' to which she constantly refers in her later writings. 'In the course of these services', she records, 'the thought of the Passion of Christ entered into my being, once and for all'.

Her conversion to Christianity was thus caused by a conjunction of, on the one hand, her poignant experience of the *'malheur'* and, on the other, of the 'beauty of the world', a phrase no less frequent in her writings. This, as she says, 'sudden capture . . . by Christ' was due to the vision of a love and beauty shining through the *'malheur'* of the world like the 'smile upon a beloved face'. Through and beyond the misery she beheld the mercy. And it was typical of her temperament that it was in the beauty of music, poetry and personality that she found this climacteric experience of Christ.

Her tale of this 'capture' by Christ has been criticized by Mr. Graham Greene as pretentious and absurd. If it be so it would seem that the majority of the mystics and saints, for whom such a sudden recognition of a supernal Beauty, as St. Augustine said, 'the flash of a trembling glance', is almost a commonplace of mystical experience, come under the same indictment.

The fruit of this experience is to be found in the books which poured from her pen in the remaining five years of her life, all of which, with the exception of *La Condition Ouvrière,* belong to that final phase. The harvest of this period of intense, almost feverish productivity (as though she were conscious of writing against time) has been collected in five books of letters, notes, essays and memoranda—*Attente de Dieu, La Pesanteur et la Grâce, Intuitions Pré-Chrétiennes, La Connaissance Surnaturel and L'Enracinement*—and further volumes of her *'cahiers'* are in course of publication. Of these books only *L'Enracinement,* a memorandum upon the rights and obligations of the State and the individual, undertaken for the provisional French government in London, is not specifically religious in content and character, although that work also is permeated with religious premonitions and insight. In these *pensées*—for such, in the main, they are—the development and deepening of her thought, faith and brilliant insights into the nature of religious reality as well as of contemporary sociological and industrial problems can be traced. In all of them faith and life are closely inter-related. In none of them does she leave the earth and her persistent and arduous engagement with her actual conditions.

It is, in truth, a continually developing faith which is there to be found—a development which had certainly not ceased at the time of her premature death in the plenitude of her powers.

Although her heart seems to have been fixed, from the first, in an essentially Christian faith, Simone Weil was never afraid of either speaking or changing her mind. Some have found a certain arrogance in her blunt expressions of opinion. But, when convinced that she was at fault, she could show a profound humility. Although, for most of us, her mind and quality were very far from mediocre, she constantly confesses and deplores her own mediocrity. One of her prayers runs thus: 'O Father, since Thou art the Good and I am the mediocre, root out of me this body and soul to make them Thy possessions . . .' (*C.S. p.* 205). It is not the prayer of the proud. And it was with a profound remorse and humility that, convinced, as she thought, of error and presumption by the fall of France, she renounced her pre-war pacifism.

After the fall of France and her removal to Marseilles she formed two intimacies, with Fr. Perrin and with the famous French writer and farmer, Gustave Thibon, which elicited some of her most pregnant thought and three of her most important books. Her contact with Fr. Perrin who, as priest, naturally desired to see her, not only on the threshold, but also within the fold of the Catholic Church, constrained her to formulate what may be termed her 'threshold Christianity' in the letters and papers collected in *Attente de Dieu*. And it was in collaboration with him and a group of French Dominicans at their convent in Marseilles that the essay entitled *Intuitions Pré-Chrétiennes* was written. It was intended to become a more ambitious work along the same lines which was never written. But it remains what is, perhaps, the most full and profound statement of the very personal, original, mystical and often heterodox Christian faith in which, still outside the pale of the Catholic Church and orthodox theology, she died in 1943. From her contact with Gustave Thibon, upon whose farm she worked for a time with characteristic austerity, came the *pensées* which he has collected under the title of *La Pesanteur et la Grâce*.

In 1942 she left France for America with a view to serving her distressed country overseas and, a few months later, returned to England to work with the provisional French Government under M. Maurice Schumann in London. She wished to be parachuted into France but, in the opinion of the authorities, her strongly marked racial type made this impossible. She continued to work at high pressure and to live a life of extreme austerity. In 1943 her constitution, always frail and undermined by her intense labours and rigour of life, collapsed at last, and, in April of that year, she died alone, still on the threshold of the Church and aged only 34, at a sanatorium in Kent.

From this brief recital it will be seen that the whole of her active and productive life was spent under the pressure and in the climate

of the crisis and catastrophe of the immediate pre-war period and of the collapse of France. She saw no dawn beyond that darkness. They are conditions which must be taken into account in the assessment of the unconditional, intense and prophetic quality of her thought. It was such a climate of catastrophe as that which evoked the prophecy of Jeremiah, whose fire, fury and intensity she often seems to share.

They were conditions which also, perhaps, partly account for the uncouth, brusque and even, at first sight, ungracious and egotistical manner which, so those who knew her seem generally to testify, made her a person difficult to know. She was too direct, too much in deadly earnest, too conscious of a Word burning within her which she must deliver to 'prophesy smooth things' in a smooth manner. She was well aware of it. 'I am incapable,' she wrote, 'of employing address . . . towards those with whom I have to deal'. M. Gustave Thibon has recorded his painful first impressions of her personality. 'She disputed endlessly, in an inflexible and monotonous voice', he has told us, and added, 'I left these unfruitful sessions literally exhausted'. He speaks of this 'impossible side of her character, this unpleasing side of her nature, this formidable spontaneity', but adds that, 'unlike most people', she improved 'infinitely' in 'an atmosphere of intimacy'. She could not suffer fools or *fainéants* gladly. It may be supposed that the great Hebrew prophets were, perhaps, no less uncouth and uncomfortable to meet.

But there was more in this 'impossible' side of Simone Weil's manner than a mere temperamental trait. It seems to have been, to some extent, deliberate and ascetic, an aspect of her own deep desire for detachment. Rightly or wrongly, she believed that she must learn to be alone; she neither could nor dared attach herself to any social group, still less to a Church which, so she conceived, has become a social collectivity, *'le social'*. 'I do not want', she wrote to Fr. Perrin, 'to be adopted into a circle, to live among people who say 'we' and to be part of an 'us', to find myself 'at home' in any human *milieu* whatever'. 'I am expressing myself badly', she adds, 'for I should like it very much; I should find it all delightful. But I feel that it is not permissible for me. I feel that it is necessary and ordained that I should be alone, a stranger and exile in relation to every human circle without exception. For, so she believed, 'the flesh impels us to say *me* and the devil impels us to say *us*, or else, like the dictators, to say *I* with a collective significance'. Therefore she suspected and eschewed all 'groups', including the Roman Catholic Church.

That this, to use a contemptuous modern term, 'solitudinarianism', was rather an acquired than an inherited characteristic is

suggested by the testimony of Albertine Thévenon in her introductory note to *La Condition Ouvrière* in which she records her impressions of the youthful Simone Weil amongst the group of which the review *Révolution Prolétarienne* was the organ. She speaks of her as exacting and as showing a 'ruthless rigour', but she adds that, in that early phase and amongst these working-class folk, "she was simple, and although her general culture was so much superior to ours we had long conversations with her in a fraternal way, we chaffed her, she laughed with us, we pressed her to sing (and not always very conventional songs). She herself, seated at the foot of a little iron bed in an unbeautiful room without other furniture, often recited Greek poetry to us of which we understood nothing but which delighted us all the same by the pleasure which she took in it. A smile or a wink would make us her accomplices in comic situations. This aspect of her character was not often apparent because of the seriousness with which normally, and with an unforgettable charm, she envisaged everything." In fact, at this time and among such folk, she could be their very good *'copain'*—their 'chum'. It is not a picture which suggests a naturally supercilious or 'unclubable' person.

It seems manifest that her 'solitudinarianism', her incapacity to identify herself with any group, still less with a Church, was due, firstly, to the fact that she was, by nature, as Berdyaev described himself, a 'spiritual anarchist', and second, to a rôle in life which she deliberately adopted in pursuit of what she believed to be her vocation—'to remain', as she wrote, 'in a sense anonymous, ready to mingle myself at any moment with the mass of common humanity' at 'the point . . . of intersection between Christianity and all that is not so'.

Such a solitude, such a passion for aloneness and anonymity is not likely to be popular in an age given to gregariousness. Yet it is an urge of spirit, a 'flight of the alone to the Alone', observable in all the great crises of religious history which, in the end, has proved to be cathartic. But, whatever the merits or demerits of the case, the fact remains to be reckoned with that Simone Weil lived and died alone, that she was incapable of prophesying 'smooth things' and that, for her, too, the truth is that which, as Vernon Lee once wrote, 'cares not a button what you think of it'. It was a rigour which she applied more harshly to herself than to others.

It is thus clear that, in considering her personality and thought, we are studying one who was a child of crisis, whose whole life and mind were lived in a light of eclipse, of the disastrous end of an age and culture, to an extent which those of us who, safeguarded by our seas, have in some degree escaped the full impact of that

catastrophe, can only appreciate by a great effort of imagination. But they are conditions which still surround, which impend upon us, and which, at any moment, we may have to confront. Simone Weil's reaction to them is therefore all the more pertinent for our predicament. But those conditions also imply that a balanced estimate of her thought must expect and perhaps, in some degree, discount an element of prophetic superlative, of violent reaction from what, in that light, seemed to her unmitigated corruption, of passionate engagement with extreme circumstances. We must look to her for no calm, cool and impartial synthesis fabricated from 'above the battle', but rather for prophetic insights, for a faith forged 'amid dust and heat', for, as Kierkegaard said of his own work, a 'corrective' to the corruption of our age and, in particular, of our Christianity.

(II)

In the writings of Simone Weil we meet with certain recurrent main *motifs* or leading ideas—those of *malheur* (affliction or misery), of necessity or *pesanteur* (gravity), of the *néant* (the nothingness) to which the self and all human existence are ultimately reduced, and on the other hand, within and through that very *malheur* and necessity, an interfused 'beauty of the world' which was, for her, the sign of the love of God. Those are the foundation facts of life as she found it, of (to use her favourite metaphor) the 'egg of the world' through the hard shell of which she strove to penetrate or, as Martin Buber has it, to 'break through' in that devoted quest for truth which consumed her.

Her own 'break-through' introduces further motifs—those of what she termed *'attente'*, a contemplative labour by no means confined to the specifically religious life, the process of what she calls *'décréation'* and of *'consentement'* (assent or acceptance) leading, in Keats's phrase, to a 'dying into life', into that 'harmony' of original and eventual eternal life of which, here and now, she hears but the broken echoes.

She thus saw life on two levels—of time and eternity, gravity and grace. Of the existence and reality of the latter level of eternity and grace she seems never, even in her agnostic days, seriously to have doubted. Between these two planes of being—the point of leverage or mediation—she found that sacrificial *agape* —Love which, later, she learned to call Christ. That Love led her to a voluntary acceptance and suffering of the *malheur* of mankind and, in the Cross, she found the consummation of that sacrifice and the conquest of that *malheur* by mercy, Law subsumed in Love, gravity in grace. Against that bare outline of her belief Simone Weil's concentration upon suffering and the Cross, and

her confession that 'whenever I contemplate the crucifixion of Christ I commit the sin of envy' become comprehensible.

The conception of a basic *malheur* or affliction, implying much more than sorrow or suffering, an utter dereliction and dehumanisation of man, is the dark background of all her thought, as of her world. For her, *malheur* is the effect upon man of a full encounter with the iron necessity which she believed to underlie all human existence. It is that which, she says, introduces into the soul an 'immensity of blind, brutal and frigid force' and reduces it to its original nothingness. It is a state of slavery and 'every man', she declares, 'is the slave of necessity'.

She finds, personally experiences and analyses this state of *malheur,* particularly in her detailed account of the conditions caused by what she calls 'the monstrous mechanism of industrial production' where 'the lamps, the belts, the din, the cold, hard iron all combine to transform man . . . into a machine of flesh' under the tyranny of a 'brutality dominating every particle of the life which is passed amidst machines—a brutality which deprives life of all meaning and human relations of all humanity.

In such a state of *malheur,* as she records her own experience of it, 'the vital instinct . . . clings blindly to anything which can serve as a support as a plant clings with its tendrils. In this state gratitude (save in a debased form) and justice are inconceivable'. This *malheur* 'is as hideous as is all life stripped to the buff, like a stump, like the crawling of insects'. It is 'life without form'. 'When all attachments are reduced to that of mere survival, there the extremity of *malheur* begins', she writes, and adds that such a state of slavery and *malheur* is 'hell'.

It is a state which engenders a sense of the ultimate void, hollowness, meaninglessness of life and man, of nothingness. 'The whole universe', she says, 'is void of finality. The soul which, racked by *malheur,* cries incessantly for that finality, touches the void'. 'The principal effect of *malheur',* she writes again, 'is to force the soul to cry "Why?" as Christ cried and to repeat that cry, save when exhaustion intervenes, uninterruptedly. There is no answer'.

In the cry from the Cross—'Why hast Thou abandoned me?'—she finds the culmination of such a *malheur.* It is, it may be noted in passing, upon the same cry—'Why, Why, Why, Why, Why?'—that Peter Ustinov's play *The Moment of Truth,* so representative of the prevailing, post-war mood of Europe, concludes. Simone Weil thus anticipated a sense of the *malheur* of modern man which today spreads like a pestilence.

She found that *malheur* particularly in the conditions obtaining in mechanized industry in her day (1934-36) which she depicted

with a remorseless pen in *La Condition Ouvrière*. But she also found it, under a comfortable bourgeois façade, everywhere in the modern mechanized world—among the farm labourers and the unemployed, the full rigour of whose lot she scrupulously shared, at the front in the Spanish Civil War, in occupied France, in the concentration camps, and in the *'froid métallique'*, the metallic cold, of the modern State.

To those who, like most Anglo-Saxons, have not known the full impact of such a *malheur*, and may think her's an over-painted picture, she stresses the fact that 'we are very badly placed, from above, to appreciate and, from below, to do anything about it'. 'I believe', she added, 'that, generally speaking, that difficulty is itself one of the principal causes of human *malheur*. That is why I determined to descend to the depths of it myself'.

But it was for more than philanthropic reasons that Simone Weil descended into the 'hell' of modern *malheur*. She sought there the clue to the mystery of being and seems, from the first, to have surmised that in and beyond the exhaustion point of such an extreme *malheur* the Grail lay hidden. It was not only a humane but also a metaphysical discipline which she thus undertook. And her quest seems, from the first, to have assumed a religious character. For, early in life, she had realized that, as she wrote, 'Christianity is *par excellence* the religion of slaves'—an insight which Nietzsche had anticipated. But, for her, it was not enough to know this in the mind; she must also 'prove it upon her pulses'. She must take a 'full look at the Worst' of human *malheur* in order to find her 'way to the Better', and that 'full look' implied, for her, an *'attente'* not merely of her mind, but of her whole person.

Her conception of such an *attente* is remarkable. It dates from her experience as a student. She found then, as she records in *Attente de Dieu*, that 'if one seeks the solution of a geometrical problem with real attention and, after an hour, is no further advanced than when one began, one has nevertheless moved, during each moment of that hour, into another and more mysterious dimension'. For 'where there is real desire, if the object of desire is really for light, the desire for light begets light . . . Although the effort of attention remains apparently sterile for years, one day a light precisely proportionate to those efforts will flood the soul'. Such an *attente*, she adds, moreover, leads to 'the virtue of humility, a treasure infinitely more precious than any scholastic progress' and may be 'a way as good as any other to sanctity'.

In this discipline of *attente* Simone Weil was thus relating the rigorous integrity of the scholar and the scientist to the ascetic contemplation of the saint and adopting a rule of life as valid for the secular as the religious life. And she applied this *attente* and

integrity as rigorously to the doctrines of religion as to the theorems of geometry. It is in this spirit, with the clean integrity of the scholar and the scientist, that she writes of religion that 'one must be wholly prepared to abandon religion, even though that means abandoning all reason for living, if it be anything but the truth'.

She applies this *attente* to both worldly and spiritual problems, linking the one to the other. Thus her very realistic study of industrial conditions in *La Condition Ouvrière* leads her to the conclusion that 'the point of unity between intellectual and manual labour is contemplation', that 'fulness of attention is no other than prayer' and that 'attention is that faculty of the soul which gives access to God'. Later she finds an even greater virtue in such an *attente* in that it 'constitutes the creative faculty in man' and makes him a 'co-creator with God'. In fact she applies the maxim of St. Theresa of Avila—'I beseech you only to look'—to every aspect of life and shares her conviction of its sovereign efficacy.

It is this discipline of *attente,* with its criterion that reality is essentially 'hard and rugged', which she applies to the crucial problem of modern *malheur*. For she believed that 'the knowledge of human misery is the gate to all wisdom' and 'constrains the soul towards God'. One must therefore, she says, contemplate with this absolute *attente* a *malheur* that is without any consolation at all.

For her such an *attente,* at its highest pitch, leads out beyond itself to an 'acceptation, assent, love' which 'do not belong to this world'. From that peak of *attente* the universe is perceived, she writes, 'as an immense mass of blind obedience spangled with points of *consentement*' or assent, and such a *consentement* is 'pure love'. And such a *consentement* (acceptance or consent raised to the level of 'pure love') to the *malheur,* necessity, nothingness of human existence as such, alone has the power, in her favourite analogy, to 'pierce the egg-shell of the world' and the self, and reveal the 'beauty of the world' irradiating that *malheur* and the very texture of that necessity upon which, as she says, 'God has inscribed His signature'. For 'behind the curtain of the world is infinite mercy'.

And, on the other hand, such a *consentement,* attained only by that *attente,* reveals a 'part of the soul' which is 'mute, secret and unknown to the consciousness', a 'faculty superior to itself' and a 'felicity beyond the domain of both consolation and sorrow'. In the language of Keats it lifts the soul 'beyond the lily and the snow'. And by virtue of such *consentement* alone do we know that 'the absence of God here below is the same thing as the secret presence here below of a God Who is in heaven'.

Consentement is, in fact, acceptance of all reality, a 'pure love' of it 'from the angle of death', which thus links love with death. And, for her, 'death is that which bestows the most precious of all gifts to man'. For 'beyond death is love'. 'In order to become just', she says again, 'one must be naked and dead'. One must know 'the cold touch of the naked iron' of necessity. 'Woe to him', she declares, 'for whom the death of the body precedes that of the soul'.

In following the course of Simone Weil's thought and faith we thus come at last, not only to a profound mysticism, but also to a death-wish which is a dominating factor in the modern consciousness. It is characteristic of her that, here again, she outruns the modern mood and wrests its remedy from her very *consentement* to it. For she confronts this death-wish, which so often makes a mortuary of the modern mind, and drives its logic far beyond that of most of its devotees. She looks steadfastly not only upon the death of man or of an age, but also of God—a dying which she perceives, not only in the Cross, but also in creation itself.

She sees creation as what William Blake called a 'little death' —as the self-abandonment or 'abdication' of God. For God is Love and Love inevitably implies the abdication of self. 'Love is abdication'. 'God created', she wrote, 'that is to say, not that He produced something out of Himself, but that He withdrew Himself, allowing part of His being to be other than God'. And 'to this divine renunciation', she believed, 'the renunciation of creation, which is obedience, corresponds'.

This conviction, that Love implies abdication of the sovereignty of the self, leads her, in relation to the individual soul, to the further doctrine of what she calls *décréation*—the leap 'from the created into the uncreated', which is also a 'projection of the soul out of time'. It is a doctrine which echoes that of Jakob Boehme, with his 'once every hour throw thyself by faith beyond all creatures', 'throw thyself into That where no creature dwelleth' (*Signatura Rerum*).

Such a *décréation* is, for her, the sole act of free will of which man is capable. 'Every thinking being', she writes, 'is worthy of love solely because it has received existence by the creative act of God and possesses the capacity to renounce that existence through the love of God'. It is the 'infinitely small particle of the soul which does not belong to this world', the faculty of *consentement* or 'pure love', the divine Love which is 'the very base of our being', which makes this possible and alone links the created with the Uncreated.

'Every man' therefore, she concludes, 'should regard his own existence as a sacrifice of God. I am the abdication of God . . . I

must reproduce the abdication of God inversely and deny the existence which God has given me'. Such a *décréation* induces God to descend into us. For it is only by grace that we can be saved from the iron law of *pesanteur*, gravity, necessity. 'We cannot take even a step towards heaven', she declares. 'Ascent is forbidden to us. But if we look heavenwards for a long time God descends and lifts us up'.

Therefore, for Simone Weil, as for Pascal, the 'I' is hateful; it belongs to the *néant*, the nothingness of existence. 'It is sin in me which says "I" ', she writes, 'to say "I" is to lie'. 'God only has the right to say "I am".' Moreover, to renounce the 'I', the self, is thereby to transform the face of necessity; for 'necessity is the enemy of man so long as he thinks in the first person'. Nevertheless she envisages a real 'I' which is hidden for me (and for others), which is on God's side, is in God. She is, in fact, in such sayings, re-thinking and re-stating the Gospel doctrine that 'he that loseth his life shall save it'.

This doctrine leads her to an apparent denial of personality. But, since she does not distinguish between the two conceptions, it seems to be rather individuality than personality which she denounces and renounces. *Décréation*, she says, 'implies the renunciation of the person'. 'The goal,' she says again, 'is to lose the personality'. She finds the note of impersonality, of anonymity, characteristic of divine being. 'Whenever a man is raised to a degree of excellence which makes him, by participation, a divine being, something impersonal, anonymous is found in him. His voice is shrouded in silence. It is manifest in great works of art and thought, in the great deeds of the saints and in their words'. 'It is then', she adds, 'in a sense true that one must conceive of God as impersonal—in this sense, that He is the divine type of a person who surpasses himself by renouncing himself'.

Her conclusion concerning this mystery of personality thus remains paradoxical. For her God is, in the end, 'an impersonal Person. He loves, but not as I love, but as an emerald is green. He is "I love" '. And, she adds, 'were I in a state of perfection I, too, would love as an emerald is green. I would be an impersonal Person'. It is not, perhaps, logically, a very satisfactory conclusion. But Simone Weil was, in such matters, not logician but lover.

This 'Scale of Perfection' by way of a steadfast *attente* through abdication and *décréation* to the *consentement*, which is 'pure love' and obedience, is thus a *via negativa*, a way of negation familiar to all students of mysticism. It centres upon the Cross but leads out beyond the Cross to a final 'harmony' in which *malheur* is transformed into the matrix of divine Love, and *pesanteur* (or necessity) into the obedience of creation to the Creator, the pattern of that

human obedience which alone can draw down that redeeming Love.

Of that primal and ultimate harmony she wrote towards the end of her life—'The cry of Christ and the silence of the Father together make the supreme harmony of which all music is only an imitation. . . . The whole universe, including our existences, which are small particles of it, is only the vibration of that supreme harmony'. This is the harmony which she finds in Plato and Pythagoras—'the union of contraries and the combination of that which limits and that which is limitless', 'the beauty of the world', the equipoise of gravity and grace. It is the eternal Love and Beauty which is only to be known by those who can look 'without stretching forth the hand' to grasp. That 'harmony' was Simone Weil's 'heaven'.

A synopsis of Simone Weil's life, thought and faith makes it clear that she was, by nature, not only, in all essentials, a Christian but also a mystic. Indeed, for her, the one implied the other. And she was an original, what Kierkegaard called an 'exception'. She thinks for herself, and sees for herself, and owns no other authority than the integrity of her own spirit and her intimations of Divine truth and beauty. For her, as Robert Browning wrote, only the 'soul and God stand sure'. Her insights are the 'flash and counter-flash of meeting' between those opposite poles of her being in a relation, a dialogue of love. And there she could accept no intermediary. That, for an authoritarian Church, is her prime and unpardonable offence.

Therefore she neither could nor would accept the mediation of the established Church or any other social grouping which interposed between her and God in that innermost intercourse of love. But not for that reason alone. She believed profoundly that her lot lay, not with any *élite,* but with the miserable mass of mankind. 'Nothing gives me more pain', she wrote, 'than the idea of separating myself from the immense and unfortunate multitude of unbelievers'. 'I cannot help wondering whether in these days . . . God does not want there to be some men and women who have given themselves to Him and to Christ and who yet remain outside the Church'. Moreover, in her view, the Roman Church was tainted with totalitarianism. 'There is an absolutely insurmountable obstacle', she wrote to her friend, Fr. Perrin, 'the use of the two little words *anathema sit.* It is that also which prevents me from crossing the threshold of the Church'. For her Christianity implied the freedom of the spirit under God and a catholicity inclusive not only of church-members but, potentially, all mankind. And in the

Church of Rome, though she found much to admire and love, she did not find those signs of Christ.

Nor did her very original conception of Christianity conform to the conventional account of its history and sources. Her hatred of *'le social'* caused her to abhor, as she saw it, the brutal collectivism and unspirituality of both Israel and Rome. In a brilliant but very unorthodox sketch of pre-Christian history, she traced the origins of Christianity rather to Egyptian, Pelasgian, Iberian and Greek than to either specifically Jewish or Roman sources. She found 'pre-Christian intuitions' in the Iliad and Greek drama, in Greek Stoicism, philosophy and mathematics, in Norse mythology and the Bhagavad-Gita. It was as though, in history as in society, her sympathies were always with the hidden, suppressed and unacclaimed rather than with the dominant, established and accepted elements. 'One must love that which is dumb, anonymous, disappeared', she writes, 'it is the false grandeur which is transmitted'. She was, in fact, as revolutionary as she was original in mind.

The fountain-head of her faith was, in reality, neither a Church nor a tradition but a profound and very personal mysticism, which is often expressed in imagery as erotic as that of St. John of the Cross and most of the Christian and pagan mystics. But she considers that phenomenon with scientific detachment. Thus—'sexual energy is not seasonal', she notes, 'it is the best sign that it is not destined for natural usage but for the love of God'. 'There is an essential difference', she says again, 'between the mysticism which turns towards God and the faculty of love and desire of which the physiological basis is sexual energy, and the false imitation of mysticism which, allowing this faculty its natural direction and giving it an imaginary object, labels that object with the name of God'. 'Discrimination between the two is difficult', she adds, 'but it is possible'.

Nevertheless it is upon a frankly amorous mysticism that her faith is founded. 'This relationship between God and the soul' she writes, 'resembles that of the bridegroom with the bride, still a virgin, on the bridal night . . . So is the union of the soul with God'. And, for her, *consentement* (which is 'pure love') is 'the Yes of marriage . . . the consent to the union of the Christ with the eternal element in our soul'. First and last, her religion is a religion of Love. She states it in the simplest of terms: 'Faith is the belief that God is Love and nothing else'. But, she corrects herself, 'that is still not well expressed. Faith is the belief that reality is love and nothing else'. There, for Simone Weil, is the beginning and the end of the whole matter.

It is, then, primarily, the picture of a mystic—a mystic of no

mean stature—which the study of the life and works of Simone Weil leaves in the mind. As such there can be little doubt that she will live on in the rare and immortal company of genuine mystics. But she was more than the mystic who offers only unrelated intuitions about the inner nature of reality. With her, intuition and reason are not dissociated; she had an excellent, well-trained and disciplined mind, and she used it to systematize her insights. She made her own map of this world and the other and, as a philosopher, strove ever to relate the one to the other. She had no use for mere 'pie in the sky'. Hers was a mysticism which comes to terms with most of the salient problems—sociological, political, historical—which perplex the modern mind. She was also, in fact, what Hans Martensen called Boehme—a 'theosophist' expounding a system of a divine, coherent and comprehensive wisdom—a 'sacred philosophy'. It is, indeed, with Boehme that, in this respect, she most invites comparison.

Of that 'sacred philosophy', in her short life, she was able to give little more than a sketch which, had she lived longer, her eager and sinewy reason would certainly have completed in some *Signatura Rerum* of her own. It is, perhaps, too scanty, it is certainly too soon, for any full or final assessment of its worth for our world. Her chief significance seems to be this—that, at a time when the synthesis of the first Christian age and, as a general life-view, traditional Christianity, are in process of dissolution, she essayed her own synthesis based upon a Christianity re-conceived and re-related to the actual life which, in our modern world, men live. In that great and urgent venture of mind and spirit, it may be that she was, at least, a fore-runner.

But, perhaps, her salient significance for our age is upon the plane not of speculation, but of sanctity. As she saw and said—'To-day it is not nearly enough merely to be a saint . . . We must have a sanctity which the present time requires, a new sanctity, itself without precedent . . . a new up-springing, a discovery . . . The world needs saints who have genius as a plague-stricken town needs doctors'. Such a secular sanctity—no 'fugitive and cloistered virtue'—but a sanctity descending deep into the 'dust and heat', the *malheur* of modern humanity, she not only preached but practised. And here too, and here perhaps most greatly and effectively, Simone Weil was—please God!—a fore-runner. She was certainly 'a burning and a shining light'.

THE POPE'S MEN

By Nathaniel Micklem, D.D., Ll.D.[1]

The Roman Catholic Church is an institution both larger and more picturesque than the Congregational Union; it is represented more frequently than any other denomination in the cinema, and I rarely take up *The Times* without discovering at least some snippet of information from Roman Catholic sources. But then the Roman Church is, with the possible exception of the Comintern the most powerful 'pressure-group' in the world, and it pays particular attention to Press and Cinema. In England Roman convents and schools have been springing up all over the place, and on Sundays, while we lament our empty pews, it is not uncommon to see large crowds jostling their way out of the Roman Churches. If there is a notable Roman conversion, we are sure to be told about it, and some of our own people, we fear, are 'being got at'. The Roman Church is, then, a noisy church, always calling attention to itself and asserting its claims. We tend to resent, and yet secretly to envy, its skilful publicity. The bad old Protestant rancour, we are told, has practically disappeared. Certainly we do not feel rancorous (whatever that may be), but what ought we to think about our Roman neighbours and their ecclesiastical pretensions? Are not they forging ahead, while we at best just hold our own? Are they not a menace to us and to our country?

It is extraordinarily difficult to give a fair answer to such questions, for the Roman Church is a protean institution. Proteus was one of the gods of antiquity. He used to sit on the sea-shore, and men would come to consult him. But he was very hard to catch. He had the disquieting habit of changing shape; he might turn into a lion or tiger, or he might disappear in a flame of fire or a whirlwind or a rushing stream. The Roman Church is a little like that. It has many shapes and appearances, and it is hardly possible to make any true statement about it which is not sometimes or partly or in some places false, and no institution less deserves its motto, *semper eadem*, 'always the same'. It has its party manners and its home habits. As a general rule, it is on its best behaviour where it is in a minority in a Protestant country, and shows its least attractive expression where it holds political power. Some twenty years ago I spent a summer away in the Province of Quebec and watched, as best I could, the Roman Church in action.

[1] This paper was written for and at the request of the Life and Work Committee of the Congregational Union of England and Wales.—Ed.

I remember concluding that it was both the greatest blessing and the greatest curse of the countryside—the greatest curse, or at least the greatest blight, because it kept the people ignorant, poor and superstitious, prevented them from freedom, progress, wisdom, yet their greatest blessing because, unlike the urban proletariat, they were contented with their lot in this world and lived in the light of an immortal hope.

But what do Roman Catholics believe? Well, if it comes to that, what do Protestants (as distinct from ministers and theologians) believe? About the official doctrines of the Roman Church there is no doubt at all, but what 'the faithful' believe is another matter. I offer two illustrations. The Roman Church officially teaches the doctrine of transubstantiation. That is a highly philosophical and speculative doctrine about what happens to the wine and wafer in the Mass when the priest utters the consecrating formula. It is quite certain that the vast majority of Roman Catholics cannot believe that doctrine, since their education does not permit them to understand it; what they do believe, however, is that when the bell rings, Christ Himself is verily present with them for their worship and their adoration. I judge transubstantiation to be a highly unsatisfactory account of the mystery; but that Christ is really present to His believing worshippers who shall deny? Second, it is quite certain that in official Roman Catholic doctrine the Virgin Mary is not a goddess; to her must be offered reverence (*douleia*) but not that worship (*latreia*) which is due to God alone. But I cannot doubt that in popular Roman Catholic piety the Virgin Mary is a goddess in everything but name; indeed, it would, I think, be fair to say that much of popular Roman Catholicism is Mary religion. From the point of view of the New Testament and Reformed theology this is deplorable, but we should not lightly speak of this as paganism or as idolatry; an intellectual perversion of Christianity it is, for the Virgin Mary is set beside, or even takes the place of, her Son, but Mary-religion, so to call it, is suffused with Christianity; it is a bye-form of the Christian religion which takes so many forms. Popular Romanism in many lands, too, is rife with superstition, often of the crassest kind. Protestants might hesitate to claim that their communities are free from superstition, but whereas Protestantism in practice as well as theory seeks to eradicate superstition, the Roman Church as a whole does not.

Roman Catholics, it is often said, are not allowed to think for themselves; they have to believe whatever their priest tells them, and he is bound by the rigid and antiquated dogmas of his Church. That is far too true, but it is not wholly true. No one in the Roman Church may deny a dogma of that Church except at the price of excommunication, and the clergy will get into very serious trouble if they question in public any official pronouncement as to what

may and what may not be taught; but this leaves a good deal of latitude for clever and ingenious scholars; they are much freer today than they were two generations ago. The laity, it is true, are not encouraged to discuss dogmatic issues, for, if you imperil your immortal soul should you happen to think wrong, it will be best not to think at all and to accept the Church's dogmas with implicit faith. But any suggestion that Roman Catholics do not think would be monstrous; how much all contemporary Protestant theologians owe to the thought of such men as von Hügel, Maritain, D'Arcy and Christopher Dawson!

But does not the Roman Church keep the Bible from the people? It has kept the Bible from the people, and it still does keep the Bible from the people, but elsewhere it brings the Bible to the people. The Bible has just been translated afresh into English by a Roman scholar, and the rise of Bible societies within the Roman Church has been very remarkable in recent years. How difficult, how impossible, it is to give a quite truthful picture of this Church!

But what is the lure of the Roman Church, how does it attract some of those who ought by tradition and upbringing to belong to us? There are many reasons, some creditable and others reprehensible. We have lost young people to the Roman Church because there they have found religion as they have not found it in our Services. Many years ago I spent Easter Sunday in Hungary. I was taken to the St. Matthew Church in old Buda where all the kings of Hungary were crowned. It is, or was, a beautiful church; it was packed; we scarcely got places in a gallery under the roof. Contrary to law many from the orchestra of the opera-house had been brought in to accompany the great organ. The music was magnificent, the ritual gorgeous, the congregation eagerly devout. I could see little of the ceremonial and in any case pontifical high mass seems to me a strange form of Christian public worship. But even for me as a dissident 'outsider' that Service was religiously impressive, for priests, musicians and congregation seemed alike to be declaring from a full heart, that the Lord is risen, He is risen indeed. In the following year, as it so happened, I attended Service on Easter Sunday in the chapel of my boyhood. The minister (who has since departed to be with the Anglicans and has, I hope, learned better) began his sermon with these words, "*Prima facie,* my brethren, the Resurrection presents us with a problem". That is why, unfortunately, but not altogether surprisingly, some have left us for the Roman Church. But that sermon was preached some thirty years ago, and we have moved since then.

Others leave us for Anglo-Catholicism or for Rome for another not wholly discreditable reason. We are not only Protestants, we are in the Puritan tradition also. Now Puritanism (in the wide

sense of the term) has no necessary connection with Protestant doctrine. It is an austere, inward, deep and personal form of religion, relatively independent of external forms and deeply suspicious of aesthetic helps and practices. It is naturally adapted to the spiritual needs of certain temperaments. Its attendant danger, to which we have often been prone, is that of a false spirituality which forgets that man is not pure spirit but body-spirit, and that religion must find its expression in the outward and material if it is to redeem the whole of man; this false spirituality at times becomes a form of Manicheism, the doctrine that matter itself is evil, and that our salvation is not a salvation *in* the world of sense but a salvation *from* it. There is no necessary connection between this Puritan temper and Protestant doctrine; the temper has not infrequently been found inside the Roman Church, and, on the other hand, it is not possible for us to be more deeply and securely Protestant in doctrine than is the Church of Sweden, yet that Protestant Church retains many of the rites and much of the ceremonial of the medieval Church. If we only offer to men one type of religion and of Service, and that adapted to the need of one temperament only, we should not be surprised that those of another temperament turn elsewhere for their religion.

Further, the Roman Church today is winning many converts because it offers shelter and authority. We live, as we know, in revolutionary times; we witness the break up of an era and, perhaps, the birth-pangs of a new; everything that can be shaken is being shaken; no man's bank balance is secure, and no man who thinks is free from perplexities and mental turmoil. Little wonder that men tremble for what is coming upon the earth; they are like children caught suddenly in a thunder-storm who rush pell-mell to their mother's arms to hide their faces in her bosom. The Roman Church caters for fearful spirits of that sort; it will treat them as children—and be content to keep them as children; it is Mother Church.

It claims authority. One would have expected that in the modern world with its demand of freedom such a doctrine as that of Papal Infallibility in faith and morals, so alien to the temper of the times, so open to devastating criticism on philosophical, historical and religious grounds, would at least have been kept in the background by apologists for Rome. But no, it seems to be one of the effective weapons in the armoury of Roman propaganda that men are offered an infallible authority. The reason must be that in these days of appalling uncertainty when men can find neither in themselves nor in the teachers of their youth any final and compelling answers to their questions, they are apt to accept any institution, whether it be Marxian or Roman, that claims to know the truth and to be firmly anchored. God cannot have meant

us to be at the mercy of the latest scientific theories, of the latest word of Biblical criticism, of the relativism that besets all human thought, they say; He must have left a sure and trustworthy authority; no one claims such authority except the Pope with his immense prestige; it is but common sense to take his comfort and accept his word. Moreover, through confession and priestly absolution he offers a formal and guaranteed forgiveness to all troubled consciences.

For these and suchlike reasons men and women leave us and take refuge with the Pope. What can we do to change the situation and even reverse the process? Various ways may be considered; there is the way of political action and repression; it is hardly open to us now, and if it were, we would not take it. There is the way of counter-propaganda which largely takes the form of 'atrocity stories' (largely true) about what Rome is and does in Spain, in Mexico and other places. This is not a very attractive way, nor is it at all effective, for it in no way meets the spiritual issues described above. Besides, we should remember that, if the 'atrocity stories' that are told about us are very different from the Roman, they are not for that reason less atrocious. If Rome has been grievously unfaithful to our common Master, so have we also. No, we can only meet the Roman menace, a real menace which I would not minimize, by an enlargement of our hearts, by a quickening of our understanding, and a deepening of our religious life such that we can look Rome in the face without fear knowing that we have a deeper and more satisfying answer.

Thus men have left us for Rome because they have found there a firmer and more triumphant hold upon the great facts of our redemption, a surer grasp of the supernatural world above us and around than they have found with us. Where this is true, if it still be true, of any of our ministers and churches, we have fallen from Protestantism as well as from the Gospel, and we must repent. In the second place, granted that we have the Gospel, we have been far too little aware of the degree to which we have interpreted the Gospel in terms of the prejudices, conventions, standards and respectabilities of the middle classes. The individualism and depreciation of sacraments which came in with the late Victorian era are not derived from the Gospel or the Protestant Reformation. We must not be surprised at our losses if we offer a partial or mutilated version of the religion we profess. Once more, timid and frightened souls have run to Rome for shelter. We should seriously ask ourselves whether we have not encouraged men and women to seek shelter from the storm when we should have given them faith and courage to withstand the storm. They have gone to Rome seeking authority because they have not found authority with us; they have sought the kind of authority which man on this earth

is not meant to have; but they would not have left us had we given them a true and evangelical doctrine of authority such as is relevant to faith and insight. Rome, in fact, is no spiritual menace to us, if we know and live by the Gospel as the Reformers understood it.

But Rome is in other ways a menace. It is, often at the same time and in the same place, two quite different things; it is a church and it is a politico-ecclesiastical engine. In its latter capacity it is a more serious menace than we in our easy-going way are willing to recognize. But before I come to expatiate on that, let me stress the fact that it is, or it often is, a church, a real, though in our view in many respects an errant, church.

It is horribly true that in many places the Roman Church has been, and still is, grievously corrupt, so corrupt that it does not even seem a parody of the Christian faith or the Christian society. That is the aspect of the Roman Church which Protestant propaganda often has set before us; but in most places the picture is only partially true, and elsewhere it is hardly true at all. I know something of the Roman Church from within. Not long before the last war the Royal Institute for International Affairs asked me to visit Germany and write an authoritative account of the Roman Church under the Nazi oppression. Because of the Gestapo and the documents I carried it was not desirable or safe that I should stay in hotels where my luggage in my absence could be searched; I had to travel as unostentatiously as possible. I asked the Dominicans in Oxford, for whom I have a very high regard, to help. Through their intervention I was invited to stay in their monasteries wherever I liked in Germany. I made good use of this kind invitation. On many evenings after a day of visits and interviews I retired to the safety of a monastery where, when the telephone was firmly shut in its box, the Gestapo could not overhear our conversation. We talked freely of politics, of theology, of religion. They were happy times. With the Dominicans I enjoyed unshadowed fellowship in Christ. I know well that they are a select company, and that the Roman Church in Germany or France is very different from the Roman Church in Spain, in Italy, in the Argentine or Mexico, but my book *National Socialism and the Roman Catholic Church,* will afford the reader plenty of evidence that the Roman Church in Germany under persecution witnessed a good confession. Rome still has its saints, its scholars, its martyrs both among the laity and in the priesthood. Doctrinally I with all other Protestants differ profoundly from Roman Catholics, but Roman Catholic piety at its best is a very beautiful form of Christianity. Let us not forget that.

But the Roman Church as a politico-ecclesiastical engine is a terrible menace to freedom and even in many places to true religion itself. 'Catholic Action' is a vast organization of the Roman laity

under the strict control of the hierarchy. Its purpose is to claim the whole of the national life, wherever it is, for Christ. The ideal is unexceptionable, and much that Catholic Action seeks to do should have our full sympathy and, where possible, our co-operation. But unhappily the Roman Church has identified the cause of Christ with the prosperity and power of the Roman Church as an institution. The Church aims unceasingly at political power and the use of public money, and all Roman Catholics in public life and industry are required to put before all other considerations the welfare of the Church. In this country, as we know, Communists and their 'fellow-travellers' are always seeking, not unsuccessfully, to infiltrate into positions of power and influence in Trade Unions and elsewhere. We must reckon that precisely the same ceaseless propaganda is carried on behind the scenes by the Roman Church in its endeavour to control public life in this and other lands. Of course they would say that they do all this for Christ, but unhappily in their work for Christ there is often so little of Christ and so much of the world.

We have recently fought a terrible war for freedom. At the end of it we find two great powers left in Europe, Marxism and Roman Catholicism, and neither of them cares much for freedom as we understand it. Indeed, it has been said with some justification that the Communist Party is a kind of inverted and secularized Jesuit Order; it is the Roman Church which gives warrant for the belief, accepted and practised by totalitarian States, that truth is what we say it is. In recent years the Vatican has issued some very remarkable encyclicals on the Social Order. These documents are patient of a liberal and democratic interpretation; they are so taken and expounded by many sincere and liberal and democratic Roman Catholics. We must be thankful for them, but we must not be deluded into the view that they are really representative of their Church or at least representative of the policy of the Vatican, which is dominated by the seemingly ineradicable craving of the hierarchy for power and privilege. To obtain power and privilege the Vatican is prepared to tie the Church hand and foot to any kind of State, no matter how reactionary it be; nor may we wisely doubt that, for all its hatred of Communism, it would come to an agreement with Stalin tomorrow, if such an agreement might seem to serve the interests of the Church. The policy of the Vatican is an astute opportunism resting upon a calculation of benefits to the Church as an institution.

One of the very dubious episodes in recent Roman history was the loud propaganda in this country about education. Everywhere the leaders of the Roman Church proclaimed their passionate adherence to the doctrine that it is the right of all parents to have their children educated in the parents' faith. On this ground they

claimed their own schools and the full support of public money. It may be that in some countries such as Southern Ireland the Roman hierarchy genuinely accepts this doctrine; but the dominant and elsewhere avowed Roman Catholic principle is that error has no rights, and Protestantism is a very dangerous error. It is, I think, probably true that there is more religious freedom in Marxist countries than in Roman Catholic, but there are exceptions to this, such as Austria and Southern Ireland.

All Christians owe a loyalty to Christ which must take precedence of all earthly loyalties. Our Queen would not have it otherwise. But Roman Catholics have unfortunately identified loyalty to Christ with obedience to a foreign prince. It is true that the Pope is much more than a foreign prince, but a foreign prince he is, claiming unconditional obedience in the name of Christ in all matters of faith and morals. There is no major political issue that has not its moral aspect, and once the Pope has certified an issue as moral, all Roman Catholics everywhere must obey him whatever be the law or interest of their fatherland. It is claimed that the Pope, though incidentally a foreign prince, does not interfere in the internal politics of other countries. Certainly he encourages now the infiltration of Roman Catholics into all parties rather than the organization of Church parties; but wherever supposed Church interests are concerned, the priests will tell the people how they are required to vote; the priests will get their instructions from the hierarchy which is directly subject to instructions from the Vatican. Anyone who doubts this should study carefully the history of Malta, particularly under the recent regime of Lord Strickland, but there is plenty of evidence from every land.

The Roman Church, which is a school of saints and a Christian Church, is also an elaborately organized international pressure-group that takes its instructions from Rome as the Communists take theirs from Moscow. The parallel is painfully close. Communists taking their orders from Moscow and seeking to overthrow our present democratic way of life we naturally regard as a kind of 'fifth column' in the land; Roman Catholics, taking their orders from the Vatican and desiring for this country a very different order from that which we now enjoy, are in the same sense a 'fifth column' here. But is that fair? Do the Roman Catholics really wish to overthrow our democratic way of life and take away our freedoms as do Communists? The answer, I think, is that a great many Roman Catholics in England, in America, in France and Germany love freedom and democracy as we do. Some day their views may prevail within their Church, but their views do not prevail today. The vast majority of Roman Catholics will obey the instructions which they receive and, if we want to know the kind

of changes in our national life which the Vatican would impose if it could, we should do well to study the Lateran Treaty with Italy and observe the lines along which the Roman Church likes concordats with modern States to be constructed. If that Church could have its way, all education would be in the Church's hands; it alone would decide all marriage laws; the canon law of the Church would be recognized as binding by the State; not only would the Roman Church be 'established' but no public propaganda for 'error' (including Protestantism) would be permitted; there would be a strict censorship of the Press, and, although there might be no direct alteration of democratic procedures, the voice of the hierarchy would be obeyed in all matters deemed to concern the Church or morals.

But all this would be devised in the name of Christ, and, after all, the morals for which the Roman Church is concerned are Christian morals; how much better, then, it may be argued, is this than anti-Christian Communism. On paper much better, and in many respects much better in fact also. But we have set our hearts upon what we call 'the Welfare State'; into this, as we realize it, we shall take up all that is good and ideal in Communism; but the Vatican as at present controlled is deeply committed to political reaction. We should therefore be very wary of invitations that reach us from Rome to join in a common Christian anti-Communist front. Those who love freedom cannot share the political ideals either of the Vatican or of the Communists. Finally, the maintenance of the Protestant Succession is not an obsolete or unnecessary principle, and as long as the Vatican is a centre of political intrigue (among other activities) and the Pope remains a foreign prince demanding the obedience of many of Her Majesty's subjects in all matters where he says that morals are concerned, we are right to view with real anxiety the intrusion and influence of Roman Catholics in the Foreign Office.

But this is not the whole truth. The Roman Church is much less homogeneous than it appears; there are fierce tensions within it, and I must now somewhat qualify what I have said. There is, I think, no doubt that when during the war Cardinal Hinsley proposed and inaugurated the movement called 'the Sword of the Spirit', it was his purpose and intention that Protestants and Roman Catholics should participate in that movement as equal partners and should work together for the national regeneration as far as they could. The Cardinal cannot have made such a revolutionary proposal without the personal approval of the Pope; but his intention has been utterly frustrated. 'The Sword of the Spirit' is now but a branch of 'Catholic Action' wholly subject to the hierarchy and engaged upon the service of the Roman Church.

I will venture the assertion that no forward-looking, liberal, catholic movement within the Roman Church has any hope of life or success unless it can go to the fountain-head and receive the blessing of the Pope. Even then it is likely to be defeated by the dead weight of hierarchical pressure. I do not identify what I have called 'the policy of the Vatican' with the personal wishes of the Pope. There is some reason to think that the Pope may now be truly called 'the prisoner of the Vatican' in that within his own Church his power is strictly circumscribed. There are many Roman Catholics with whom we may have fellowship in Christ without any sense of an intervening barrier; there are many who feel much as Protestants do about the political reaction to which their Church is committed in so many lands; there are reform movements of many kinds within that Church; there is in places penitence. We have no means of estimating how strong these forces may be. I for one cannot imagine the Roman Church as a whole turning Protestant in the sense of accepting Methodist or Presbyterian or Congregational traditions and practices, but we may hope, and we ought to pray, for a new Reformation, such as may seem good to Almighty God, within the Roman Church itself. I regard it as sheer folly and wishful thinking to close our eyes to the present menace of Rome to freedom and even to religion itself, but how glorious a reformed Roman Church might be!

I seem to have written much about politics and little about doctrine. In conclusion, then, I return to theology and sound doctrine. To hint, as I have hinted, that the Roman Church may even be a menace to religion is a very grave charge that may not be lightly made. Protestants have rejected the authority and the jurisdiction of the Roman See. How often have I heard it said that this Protestantism, which has repudiated authority, leads to individualism, to fanaticism, to rationalism, to Unitarianism, to scepticism, to atheism. There is a regular Rake's Progress which in varying patterns is frequently sketched for us by Roman Catholics and their fellow-travellers. We find it all very unconvincing, but we should do well to consider how far it may be true. There is some connection between Protestantism and the intellectual chaos of the modern world. What we may rightly claim is that there is no *necessary* connection between Protestantism and Individualism, Rationalism, Unitarianism and Un-belief. So, too, I grant gladly and fully that there is a contradiction and not a necessary connection between Romanism and atheism, but I feel bound to acknowledge that in fact and in history Rome is the Mother of atheism in many lands. It is fair to say that for centuries in Italy, in Spain, in South America, Rome has had a free hand. To the inhabitants of those countries in large measure religion means

Christianity, and Christianity means the Roman Church, as they see it intellectually and politically reactionary; there is no great cause to wonder that the intellectuals and the working classes on the whole will have nothing to do with religion and proclaim themselves atheists or 'free-thinkers'. Roman Catholics are (not so infrequently) liberal-minded men in politics and thought; there are many Roman saints who are never canonized. But in many parts of the world the institution known as the Roman Catholic Church brings a blight upon the political, the intellectual and even the spiritual life of the country. The institution is not presenting to men the Christ of the New Testament, is not proclaiming the everlasting Gospel even to its own people, is not showing the world the Christian fellowship. The heirs of the Protestant Reformation may in the sight of God have not been less unfaithful to their vision and their calling, but we must be honest as well as sorrowful in our judgment of what, not in theory but in practice, the Roman institution represents.

Between us and the Roman Church there are deep theological disagreements. We believe that it misrepresents the Christian faith and the mind of Christ in important and far-reaching respects. But let us first be clear how deep is our agreement. The official creed of the Roman Church is the so-called Nicene Creed, which may quite properly be called the creed of the universal Church. It is true that we Congregationalists do not normally use this creed in our public worship, and we should not dream of refusing Church membership to some one who stumbled over particular phrases of the creed. So far as we are concerned, it is a man-made document drawn up in the language and according to the needs of the ancient world, and it has no authority for us except in so far as it is drawn from Scripture; but no scholar would deny that under the thought-forms of an earlier age and subject to the occasions and insights of that age it is a real summary of the Apostolic faith. Upon what we may call the great fundamentals of the Christian faith, that we worship God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, the Saviour of the world, that He died for our sins, that He rose again for our justification, that we are called to the Christ-like life, there is no dispute between us. In this present pagan age and secular world, it may well be thought that the faith that unites us is far deeper than the differences that divide us. At least let us see our differences in proportion.

What, then, are our differences? I can refer only to a few. Thus, 'faith' means one thing to a Protestant and something different to a Romanist. To the Romanist faith is a virtue of the intellect whereby he gives assent to the doctrines revealed from heaven and entrusted to the Roman Church. To the Protestant

faith is that act whereby we yield our hearts to God in Christ. But here the difference is partly (not altogether) about words. We have never maintained that sound doctrine does not matter, and the Romanist usually speaks of 'love', where we say 'faith'. This gulf does not seem unbridgeable, but the Protestant doctrine of "justification by faith", the heart of evangelical religion, is a principle Romanists neither recognize nor understand. Again, we mean different things by 'grace'. The Romanist often speaks as if grace were a kind of spiritual substance infused into the soul by God; to us grace means first God's pardoning and redeeming relationship to us in Christ and, second, that new world into which we are born again in Christ. Where the Romanist speaks of 'grace', we, nearer to New Testament usage, speak of the operations of the Holy Spirit. We use different language, but we do not always mean different things.

In their prayers and praises Protestants very rarely make reference to Mary, the Mother of our Lord. Many are the sermons preached about Peter and John and Paul, but where in our churches will you hear a sermon on the theme, 'Hail, Mary, thou that art highly favoured; the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women'? This negligence is in part due, no doubt, to reaction from Roman extravagances; it is perhaps in part due to an unwillingness to think through to its ultimate consequences the mystery of the Incarnation. We should do well to suspect here a serious failure in our thought and imagination. But in the other direction Romanism goes to an intolerable extreme. The Mother of Christ is there virtually made Co-mediator, Co-intercessor, Co-Saviour with Christ himself. I have written at some length in this journal[2] upon the newly promulgated doctrine of the bodily Assumption of the Virgin. It is as certain as any historical fact can be that this doctrine was no part of the Apostolic witness, and its acceptance and proclamation by the Roman Church is the sign that this Church no longer claims to rest solely upon the testimony of the Apostles. This difference goes very deep indeed.

All Christians agree that we owe unconditional obedience to Christ. What does this mean to the Romanist? It means that he must accept whatever doctrine is set before him by the Church, however much it may offend his reason or even his common sense, that in all matters of conduct he must conform to the rules of his Church and the instructions of the hierarchy and clergy, whatever may be his private judgment, and that in all other matters he must act according to his conscience. What does a Protestant understand by obedience to Christ? To obey Christ is to walk by the Spirit. For most Christians, Protestant and Romanist alike, the require-

2 *Congregational Quarterly*, April, 1951.

ments of Christian discipleship are in many cases plain enough; but, where there is uncertainty, the Protestant may not rest upon authority; he must search the Scriptures, he must pray, he must ask advice of those who seem to him most to have the mind of Christ, he must pay heed to the traditions of the Church, and then in the last resort he must act according to his own private conscience.

In all matters of faith and morals the Romanist believes that God has vouchsafed to man an infallible authority in the papal office. The Protestant knows nothing today of any infallibilities on earth. There are many theological and historical objections to the doctrine of papal infallibility; most serious of all is the objection that the Pope claims in matters of faith and morals to take the place of Christ *vis-à-vis* the individual believer. Christ left no plenipotentiary on earth; He needs no plenipotentiary, for He is not an absent Christ, but present with His people to guide and to forgive. Romanists, as we believe, claim for the Pope an office which belongs to Christ alone, and which He has delegated to none other.

It is our principle that the Church no less than the world stands under the judgment of God, that the Church in every age must be reformed according to the word of God; the Church therefore stands in constant need of penitence and of forgiveness. The Romanist admits that in fact the empirical Church is marred by many regrettable imperfections; yet in its sacraments, its structure, its doctrine and its morals it is the perfect Body of Christ. Between these two views there is an enormous difference of emphasis, but they are not wholly incompatible with each other. Unhappily, however, the Roman Church works on the principle that what is done for the Church is done for Christ, that the service of the Church is the service of Christ, that the cause of the Church is the cause of Christ. Would indeed that the cause of the Church were the cause of Christ! No Church here is guiltless, but more, as it seems to us, than any the Roman Church seeks political power and works by the methods of the world. The Roman Church really declares Christ to the world, and really hides Christ from the world.

I have never written a dissertation with such distaste and unwillingness as I have written the foregoing pages. In some matters the Roman Church may be judged to have been more faithful than we have; we have, I judge, much to learn from our fellow-Christians, and it is always easier to see the sins of others than our own, but when I spoke to our churches a few years ago from the chair of our Union, it was of *our* needed penitence that I spoke, and if what I have written above is true, these things also should be said.

ADVICE TO A YOUNG MINISTER

By Richard Baxter
(with a Note by Geoffrey F. Nuttall, M.A., D.D.)

Apart from its intrinsic and continuing worth, this letter from Richard Baxter to a young minister, written in 1654, is of value for the vivid light it throws on Baxter's pastoral zeal and methods. It is also of interest in that certain phrases in it read almost like a rough draft of Baxter's famous work, *The Reformed Pastor*[1] (1656): the style of direct address which marks that book had its origin in personal letters such as this is.

It was characteristic of Baxter to take such pains in advising a young man whom he had never seen and to whom he was in no way beholden. A year earlier Abraham Pinchbecke had introduced himself on the ground of having read Baxter's *Aphorismes of Justification* and *Saints' Everlasting Rest*, adding that Mr. Baldwin, the schoolmaster at Kidderminster, "knows me a little". At that time Pinchbecke, who had graduated from St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, was chaplain to the second Earl of Mulgrave in London. On 22 April, 1654[2] he wrote that he was petitioned for by "the inhabitants of Mashbury in Essex to be their minister", Mashbury being but "a very little place, and so bars hopes of honour", and besought Baxter's prayers and advice. Baxter's letter was in reply to this request and to a further letter of 6 May, in which Pinchbecke wrote thus of the situation awaiting him at Mashbury: "The people I am to go to have had no good minister among them, as they tell me, time out of mind. They are very ignorant, great profaners of the Sabbath, especially the youth, and I know not of one godly master in the town; and there is but 12 houses in the town, and so may more narrowly be watched over. . . . If I should not go, I know not whether any else would, the maintenance is so small, and it but a sequestration, and the incumbent old, and no convenience of dwelling. . . . I can call none a church there yet. I cannot give to any the Lord's Supper, and for baptism I cannot tell what to think well; but I shall incline to the most charitable and merciful side till I be better satisfied". Mashbury evidently did not suit Pinchbecke, for by 1657 he was back in London, at St. Paul's, Covent Garden, as assistant to Thomas Manton, whose ejection he shared in 1662.

1 For an attractive anthology from this work, see *As Silver Is Tried*, compiled by C. E. Surman (Independent Press, 4s.).

2 Not 1659, as in *Calamy Revised*, ed. A. G. Matthews, *s.v.* Pinchbecke, *q.v.* for further particulars.

Baxter's letter, or rather the copy of it kept by himself, has been preserved among the Baxter MSS.[3] at Dr. Williams' Library, London. For access to the MSS. and for permission to publish Baxter's letter I am indebted to Dr. Williams' Librarian. The letter is printed in full, but I have not reproduced Baxter's abbreviations, spelling, punctuation or use of capitals.

G. F. N.

Dear Brother,

Having this opportunity of writing to you by Mr. Warren[4], I shall now give you my thoughts concerning the point which you mentioned in your last, *viz.* the managing of your ministerial work.

1. Still look to your ends, not only that they be right (the glory of the Redeemer, the winning and saving of souls), but also that your intention of that end be frequently and seriously acted, seeing that thereby it is that you must be animated to and in the means; and watch against the encroachment and mixture of any other ends.

2. Pray for your people as well as study for them.

3. Let them perceive by all your dealing with them that your very heart is set upon them for their salvation; and studiously avoid whatever may hinder it or may bring them to other thoughts of you. Highly esteem your interest in them, but carefully see that it be not for yourself that you esteem or use it but for Christ and them. Let go your right when by so doing you are likely to further their salvation. Avoid all law-suits and contentions with them, if possible. Let them not have any occasion to suspect you that you be worldly. Meddle as little as you can with any secular things; but set your tithes to some of your neighbours, that you may both be freed from the care and loss of time, and also from the offences and displeasure, which, if you mix yourself in such affairs, you will unavoidably incur.

4. Study to preach to them as plainly, seriously and movingly as you can speak. Let both your language and tone be as familiar as is possible. Preach to them as you would discourse with them; and studiously avoid an affected, strained, alien tone. To these ends:—

1. Dwell much on the fundamental truths, about sin, misery, redemption, the nature and way of conversion, *etc.;* and fear not oft repeating the same things, so you handsomely diversify in method and terms.

2. Study the most convincing way of preaching. Make all so

[3] MS. 59.4.168. Pinchbecke's two letters about Mashbury are MSS. 59.5.49 and 59.6.156. The correspondence contains 14 letters from Pinchbecke (not 12, as *Cal. Rev.*).

[4] John Warren, Vicar of Hatfield Broad Oak, Essex: see *Cal. Rev.*

evident to them in their own way of reasoning that they may be forced to confess that it's all reasonable which you require of them. Discover and confute their commonest objections.

3. In dealing with their sins, be sure still to meet the greatest and most damning (unbelief, hardness of heart, pride, worldliness, and sensuality or fleshpleasing); and suspect that in every man, which is so natural to all.

4. Drive home every truth to resolution and practice; and to that end set them as home as you can to the very quick of their affections. Be as serious and deeply affected yourself as is possible. To weep over them sometimes will do more than to speak to them. Let them see that you mean as you speak, and deal not as in a dubious or inferior business. And when you press any duty on them, urge them to resolve, ask them whether they do resolve or not, and let them know what will follow obeying or not obeying.

The chiefest helps that I have found to get both matter and affection for this work are these:—

1. To study well the certainty and greatness of the misery of my hearers, till my heart be moved with compassion and can deal with them as men cast overboard that are ready to perish.

2. To converse with them privately till I am acquainted with their states and the objections, scruples and misapprehensions of each man (as far as I can), which will be the best direction to me for the matter I should dwell upon.

3. To study well my own heart, whose wants and sins will furnish me with matter, supposing in common cases that other men's hearts are like my own.

4. To ponder seriously of the greatness and weight of those truths that I deliver to them (of Christ and the life to come, *etc.*), and apply them first to myself, and labour to bring them to my own heart before I bring them to theirs; for how can I hope that poor ignorant hearers should be affected with that as a matter of weight, which their teacher himself is affected with no more than if it were the lightest trifle?

5. When my heart is very dull, I find it very useful to take in hand some rousing, lively writing (such as Mr. Hooker, Mr. Pink, Mr. Fenner[5], or any that will most affect me) and to read a little till my heart grows warm; and then I am much fitter either to study or to preach.

6. But specially I must have recourse to God through Christ by believing, earnest prayer, which may revive me when other means do fail.

[5] Thomas Hooker, William Pinke and William Fenner were three of the "affectionate practical English writers" whom Baxter constantly recommends. Each of them is noticed in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

5. In preaching and private dealing, be sure to manifest as much love to your hearers as you can. Preach rather with tender, melting affection than with anger and disdain. Speak to them as lovingly as if they were your own brethren.

6. Be sure to acquaint them frequently with their duty of coming to you as their teacher and guide, to ask what they should do to be saved, and to enquire after the good way, and to seek instruction and open their doubts. You cannot so well know their leisure, nor when and where to find them, as they may know when and where to find you. Let them well understand how much of the ministerial work lieth in such private instructions and solutions and other oversight, and how much the people are bound to ask the law at their mouths and make use of them herein. Bid them come to you and welcome.

7. Those that will not, do you go oft to them, and see how they live and set them in a way of duty in families and private; and deal seriously, yet prudently, with them for the matter of their salvation. So do whenever you are cast on their society, specially when you hear of any that live in scandalous sin or gross omissions.

8. Yet deal with all private or questionable sins as secretly as you can; for sinners will hate you if you discover them by publishing it (till there's no remedy).

9. Take all opportunities to be with them in their afflictions, especially when they are in danger of death; for then their ears are open to instruction and they will more teachably entertain advice. And make them promise reformation if they recover.

10. Be as merciful and bountiful to the poor as your estate will bear: both as a great duty in itself [and] as the greatest means to win the hearts of your people and remove ill prejudice.

I shall add no more as to the winning of souls. And for the right guiding and ordering the more godly of your flock, especially young converts (a matter of great difficulty), I shall omit it now till I know what quality your congregation is of and what use you have for such directions. Only this one thing I add:—

11. I would have you keep a private meeting once a week; and let them know that it is not for separation but edification, by redeeming time for the greatest things. Spend it in prayers, praise, repeating one of your sermons or other instructions. Let your people have leave to propound any doubt concerning your sermon there, or any case of conscience, as learners expect your solution; but let them not dispute or resolve cases of doubt themselves, much less show their gifts in preaching or expounding. But if any will teach his own family, though in a preaching way, so he go not beyond his understanding and teach no errors, do not discourage him.

12. Lastly, see that all your people well spend the Lord's day. Let all that can, repeat the sermon in their families; and those that cannot, persuade them to go into those that do.

And for your carriage to your neighbour ministers, I advise you that you further the work of unity and association with all your interest and power. Do as little of God's work dividedly as you can, which concerns others to take cognizance of, and which may be done in unity. Be constant in ministerial meetings and the profitable exercises there to be performed. Join with all that fear God and are diligent in their office and live in unity, holding the fundamentals of Christian faith and practice. If any weak people or ministers about you fall into errors, heal them if possible with a spirit of meekness, and deal with them secretly rather than before others; for else pride will but animate and give them matter to glory in. This flame will go out by private withdrawing the fuel which by winds of contention will more furiously rage.

Remember also to regard the health of your body[6]; for you will find great use of it for a vigorous serving of God. Neither clog nor starve nature in your diet. Use no offensive recreation; but twice a day, an hour before dinner and hour before supper, allow yourself constantly as much exercise as your body can well bear (walking near a mile is my only recreation).

Lastly, do not weaken or damp your spirits by too much sadness and melancholy. Live so cheerfully among your neighbours that they may not be tempted by you to think of God's service as grievous and destructive to their peace and honest mirth; but rather let them see in you that godliness is the joyfullest course of life. In a word, be a faithful and importunate suitor for Christ in the whole course of your ministry; and refer yourself wholly to him for your reward, and wait patiently for the desired fruit of your labour; and patiently bear the ingratitude of men. This is all that in this haste I can give you (which little I shall yet find much in the *practice* myself), wherein the Lord grant that I may be found faithful. So I remain your loving brother,

RICH: BAXTER.

Keder[minster], July 5, 1654.

6 Pinchbecke had written: "I am almost nothing but skin and bone, and fear that I am in a consumption".

THE "CONVERSION" OF P. T. FORSYTH

By Robert McAfee Brown, D.D.

One of the happier by-products of the contemporary 'return to theology' in modern Protestantism has been the rescue from near oblivion of the thought and message of P. T. Forsyth, who has been recognized far and wide as one of the truly prophetic voices speaking to our day and age. Not only the reprinting of his major works and the articles about him, but also the constant references to him in contemporary theological writing and the forthcoming publication of at least two books devoted solely to his thought, indicate that he has found his place as a man of stature in twentieth century theology.

And yet in all the recent attention which has been given to Forsyth, there has been one curious gap, one area of his development which has been passed over in scanty fashion. This area is the very remarkable shift in theological orientation through which Forsyth passed during his ministry. Starting out as a liberal of the liberals, looked upon with suspicion by his orthodox brethren, concerned with Incarnation but not Atonement, espousing the left-wing theology of the notorious Leicester Conference of 1877, Forsyth somehow changed so completely that he left his own generation far behind and emerged as a thinker who anticipated many of the insights represented in our own day by such men as Barth, Brunner and Niebuhr. It is clear that a full understanding of Forsyth's theology thus hinges in part at least on an understanding of this 'about face'.

What were the factors which convinced him that theological liberalism led to a dead end, and that a Biblical-Pauline faith was the only adequate way to interpret life? The answer is not easy, for Forsyth was reticent about discussing the experience and it is only in a few isolated patches of his writings that there are any references to it. There is, indeed, one notable passage in *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind* which is the *locus classicus,* and in which Forsyth describes most clearly just what was involved,[1] but such passages are rare. And Principal Sydney Cave, probably as close to Forsyth as any man ever was, has stated that never once did Forsyth talk about or allude to this experience in conversation with him.[2] However, by piecing together certain passages of

1 cf. *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind* (Independent Press), pp. 192-8.
2 Cave, "Dr. P. T. Forsyth—The Man and His Writings", *Congregational Quarterly,* April, 1948.

reminiscence from other writings of Forsyth's, a few conclusions can be reached about the nature of the experience, and these are of signal importance to an understanding of Forsyth's mature theological position.

Attempts to date the "conversion" are precarious, when the evidence is as meagre as it is. The most one can say with any confidence about the time when it took place is that in the years during and succeeding his pastorate at St. Thomas's Square, London (1880-1885), Forsyth underwent a profound deepening of his theological and spiritual outlook. The shift was gradual. It can be said with some assurance, however, that the main lines of his theological thought had been secured by 1893, with the publication of his essay "Revelation and the Person of Christ" in the symposium entitled *Faith and Criticism,* and certainly by 1896, when he preached the sermon, "Holy Father". Bearing these things in mind, and taking our evidence only from what Forsyth himself has written concerning this experience, certain more definite conclusions can be established.

1. The "conversion," to use the word in the qualified sense made plain above, was partially the result of Forsyth's discovery that *liberalism did not deal in an adequate way with the ultimate issues of life.* It had been tried by him—and found wanting. Forsyth points out that when he first entered the ministry the choice was either the old orthodoxy, infallible scripture and all; or the new liberalism, lead where it might. Looking back on this period, and on the choice he first made, Forsyth comments in 1905:

> That liberalism had its work to do. I felt its force. I took part in it. And it has won—I might say all along the line. . . . But the result of the general victory of religious liberalism has been disappointing on the whole. . . . The movement was too sentimental. It interpreted the heavenly fatherhood by the earthly, instead of the earthly by the heavenly. It was cowed by Huxley, and comforted by George Macdonald. Its ethic was more altruistic than evangelical, more of effort than of faith. . . . It owed too much to Emerson, Tennyson, Browning, and even Whittier. . . . It was dazzled by a freshly-imported criticism from abroad which had not yet experienced the corrective of self-criticism. Its general tendency was to canonize freedom instead of an authority that makes free. . . . It is a spent movement.[3]

Further emphases of the liberal movement, which Forsyth had agreed with, and later found necessary to repudiate, were the tendency of the liberalism he had known to be evolutionary rather than revelational; to look upon grace, in so far as grace was considered important at all, as something that "thaws the old man

[3] *The Examiner,* Nov. 5, 1905, p. 462.

rather than makes the new man''; and an emphasis that was ''more conscious of the inner resources now set free than of the totally new life given in a new creation''.[4] It is clear that these were things to which Forsyth had subscribed, and which seemed to him unable to cope with the deeper issues of life and death.

2. Forsyth's disavowal of a distinctively liberal theology for a more positive and evangelical one, was at least partially *the result of a growing personal sense of conviction of sin.* In the passage in *Positive Preaching* this is made clear;

> It also pleased God by the revelation of His holiness and grace, which the great theologians taught me to find in the Bible, to bring home to me my sin in a way that submerged all the school questions in weight, urgency, and poignancy. I was turned from a Christian into a believer, from a lover of love to an object of grace.[5]

In an earlier article, Forsyth had stressed the same point:

> I should confess how different and how poor my views of the Cross were in my youthful theologizing days till God taught me what sin was and the theology of its cure.[6]

This sense of unworthiness was somehow borne home upon Forsyth in a most personal way. It is quite possible that, as a very brilliant university student, he had been somewhat the victim of a belief in the sufficiency of his own intellect. This possibility throws light and importance on a much later paragraph by Forsyth:

> The work of the ministry labours under one heavy disadvantage when we regard it as a profession and compare it with other professions. In these, experience brings facility, a sense of mastery in the subject, self-satisfaction, self-confidence; but in our subject the more we pursue it, the more we enter into it, so much the more are we cast down with the overwhelming sense, not only of our insufficiency, but of our own unworthiness.[7]

3. Another fact which emerges with considerable clarity is that the shift in Forsyth's thought *grew partially out of his pastoral responsibilities and relationships,* as well as his own inner struggle.

> There was a time when I was interested in the first degree with purely scientific criticism. Bred among academic scholarship of the classics and philosophy, I carried these habits to the Bible, and I found in the subject a new fascination, in proportion as the stakes were so much higher. But, fortunately for me, I was not condemned to the mere scholar's cloistered life. I could not treat the matter as an academic quest. I was kept close to practical conditions. I was in a relation of life,

[4] *Ibid.,* p. 462.
[5] *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind,* p. 193.
[6] ''The Place of Spiritual Experience in the Making of Theology'', *Christian World Pulpit,* Mar. 21, 1906, p. 186.
[7] *The Soul of Prayer,* p. 71.

> duty, and responsibility for others. I could not contemplate conclusions without asking how they would affect these people, and my word to them, in doubt, death, grief or repentance. I could not call on them to accept my verdict on points that came so near their souls. . . . In a word, I was driven to a change of front, though not of footing—to the preacher's and the pastor's treatment of the situation, which is also the New Testament view, and which is very different from the scholar's.[8]

To make use of a very over-worked but very relevant word, Forsyth's need for a more adequate theology was an existential need. It was in his experience with people that he found that he must have a gospel mightier than the one the new liberalism had given him. It was in the tumble and bustle of life, as he dealt with the agony and grief and death of his parishioners, that the positive Gospel laid hold upon him, and it was in that tumble and bustle given an existential verification.

4. The change of position was something which *cost Forsyth a great deal.* There was the spiritual and mental agony, the inner lack of balance, which a crisis, whether long or short, begets.

> I cannot myself claim to have been free born in this faith; with a great price have I procured its freedom. I have envied those who took naturally and sweetly to Christ—though they have helped me little.[9]

It was a hard path Forsyth walked, hard not only in terms of his relationship to God, but also in terms of his relationship to other men. During the later "New Theology" controversy of 1907, Forsyth was taunted for attacking something he had once espoused, and was looked upon as a traitor to free thought because he took his stand first and last on the gospel of God's grace in Christ. To preach the Cross as Forsyth did must have introduced him to a part of the pain of the Cross, for his "about face" lost him not only the allegiance of the Leicester group but caused many "liberal" friends to write him off as one who had gone conservative and reactionary. There is one passage by Forsyth written during these years which suggests the spiritual turmoil he must have gone through:

> Spiritual profit is inseparable from spiritual pains . . . obscurity is not fatal to a gospel. . . . The obscurities of faith are the reservoirs of faith. From the arduous hills our help cometh. It is by the deep sea and the steep mountains that we recruit our liberty and our power. It is not, indeed, by the obscurities that we are saved, but it is not by what passes for the simplicities that we are girt up and sanctified.[10]

5. The whole experience, it can also be ascertained, was *set*

8 *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind,* pp. 192-3, 196.

9 *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ,* p. 255.

10 *The Modern Church,* Oct. 15, 1891, p. 451-2. The proof from which this was copied is the one Forsyth corrected for the printer; the adjective "arduous" has been inserted into the galley in Forsyth's own handwriting.

in the context of Forsyth's study of the Bible. Forsyth's early days had been spent with the classics, and his constant companions were the poets. It seems that only gradually did the message of the Bible begin to speak to him in the commanding way in which the Word of God occasionally opens itself to a man.

> It also pleased God by the revelation of His holiness and grace, *which the great theologians taught me to find in the Bible,* to bring home to me my sin in a way that submerged all the school questions in weight, urgency, and poignancy.[11]

This almost incidental remark is set in the context of a discussion of his early adherence to the classics. It was through the Bible, however, that deep called unto deep. Forsyth read Ritschl, Maurice, Luther and Calvin, and found them all pointing back to the contemporaneously living Word of God in Jesus Christ, mediated through the sacramental Book. In the Bible it was St. Paul who became normative for his thought. The importance of this Biblical orientation will be seen by an examination of what Forsyth has to say of his earlier dependence upon the poets. In 1890 he wrote that although the Gospel rested for its final authority on the principle of Scripture, it should not be necessary that every sermon start from a Scriptural text. Forsyth felt at this time that the poetry of the day was Christian poetry, and cites such examples as Wordsworth, Tennyson and the Brownings. And although literary men are not priests, nor is poetry the guide of life, both are helps to the pastor.[12] With this point of view must be contrasted Forsyth's later description of his early attitude toward the poets:

> [The old orthodoxies] did not set up a standard provincial, sectarian, modern or literary. They had not arrived at the poetic sermon, the sermon of genial ethic and kindly piety, the social sermon, the literary sermon, the Tennyson sermon, and the Browning, and the Whittier worst of all. I have heard many of them, and I have preached more. Oh, do not tell me, for I know, of the romance of passion, the witchery of beauty, and the stately measure of classic grace. I have lived in the land of milk and honey and generous wine. But a curse is on us that these things cannot live. God be merciful to us sinners.[13]

Here we find Forsyth, in uncompromising terms, condemning the very thing he practised in his early ministry, and the sort of thing he advocated in print as late as 1890. What is not said, but what can with no violence to his thought be implied, is that sermons

11 *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind,* p. 193; italics mine.

12 in *Expository Times,* Sept. 1890, p. 269.

13 "The Grace of the Gospel as the Moral Authority of the Church", *Congregational Year Book,* 1906, p. 93-4. So much did this upset one reader that he wrote to *The Christian World,* which reprinted the speech, to inquire hopefully if there had not been a misprint concerning the Quaker poet, and Forsyth had not after all meant to talk about the "wittier" sermon!

had become for him expositions of the Word of God; they were no longer essays on the author's thoughts about life.[14]

6. Attention must now be given to the most important aspect of the whole experience. The change through which Forsyth went brought home to him in an overpowering way *the grace of God,* and the relationship which this not only established but itself was, became henceforth central in his life and thought and writing. As much as St. Paul, Forsyth could say, "By the grace of God I am what I am". He came to see that the change which had been wrought in him was not something for which he could take the credit, but was something which had been wrought in him by the divine priority, giving him not an explanation of life but a living and vital regeneration which was henceforth central to his understanding of Christianity. This is why the sentence, "I was turned from a Christian to a believer, from a lover of love to an object of grace",[15] is the most important sentence in the whole testimony, and the clue not only to this experience but to the whole understanding of Forsyth. He had previously, as the above testimony would seem to indicate, approached religion chiefly from the manward side. He had admired God; indeed he had sought to serve Him, and had loved Him with all his heart, soul, mind and strength. But he had had too much the feeling that he was accomplishing this himself. Gradually the conviction was borne in upon him that his shattering experience and reconstructed life which flowed from it were nothing which he had accomplished himself, but that they had been done by God at work in him. He had done nothing to earn the love of God, which had been freely given to him, in spite of the fact that he did not deserve it. He was not now someone in love with God's love; he was an "object of grace."

> I was turned from a Christian to a believer, from a lover of love to an object of grace. And so, whereas I first thought that what the Churches needed was enlightened instruction and liberal theology, I came to be sure that what they needed was evangelization, in something more than the conventional sense of that word. . . . Religion without an experimental foundation in grace readily feels panic in the presence of criticism.[16]

What Forsyth now had, or gradually was given by God, was

[14] Cf. *Positive Preaching,* pp. 5-6, and below, Ch. 7. The above sweeping statement, however, is not wholly characteristic of Forsyth's later writings. He quite often quotes from the poets in underlining points he is trying to make, and in 1911, certainly the peak of his mature reflection, he could say that "of all the arts . . . perhaps we may say that poetry is the most truly religious". (*Christ on Parnassus,* p. 240.) Nevertheless, the shift in orientation from a fundamental dependence upon the classics and the poets to the Bible is one of the hallmarks of the "conversion" Forsyth was undergoing.

[15] *Ibid.,* p. 193.

[16] *Ibid.,* p. 193-4.

"religion with an experimental foundation in grace". He now knew, as a recipient, that gracious love of God which he was called to preach. He had learned by passing through the valley of the shadow that the sheep cannot lift itself up, but must be lifted by the arms of the shepherd.

Perhaps the clearest indication of the centrality of the appropriation of the grace of God in his life is given by two pointed references which Forsyth makes to a hymn by John Newton, "Prayer Answered by Crosses". This hymn throws a good deal of light on the sort of experience Forsyth must have gone through. The writer of the hymn asks to grow "in faith, and love, and every grace", and earnestly seeks the face of God. He looks forward to an answer to his prayer in terms of a feeling of the constraining power of God's love, but instead God makes him feel the hidden evils of his heart, and his soul is assailed by "the angry powers of hell". All the plans and schemes of the writer are laid low. God seems intent only to aggravate his woe. Finally the poet calls out in despair, "Lord, why is this? . . . Wilt Thou pursue Thy worm to death"? And God replies that this is His way of answering prayer for grace and faith, concluding,

> These inward trials I employ
> From self and pride to set thee free;
> And break thy schemes of earthly joy
> That thou may'st seek thy all in Me.[17]

Now in one place Forsyth speaks of this poem as "almost holy writ",[18] and in another place he refers to it in the following terms:

> I venture to think John Newton's "I asked the Lord that I might grow" one of the greatest and most realistic utterances of Christian experience. And it represents the course our sunny liberalism must take as it passes from a trout stream of the morning to the river of God which is full of deep water.[19]

As Forsyth had been a "sunny liberal" by his own admission, we are justified in thinking that this hymn provides a substantially correct version of his own experience, and that he had learned the hard way that he must break with self, and yet could not do so unless it were the grace of God which freed him from his bondage to himself and released him to the glorious freedom of the children of God.

7. Several other things, however, are made clear about the whole experience. Forsyth felt that he had not gone through an isolated and individual type of experience; he realized that *what had saved him was also adequate to save other men,* to effect a

[17] The entire poem is conveniently printed in the back of the 1949 edition of *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind,* p. 258.

[18] *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind,* p. 195.

[19] *Ibid.,* p. 106.

"world-salvation". In one of his sermons, Forsyth talks about the "weakness of the Cross". The idea that the weakness of the Cross mocks the empire-builders is ridiculous to most, Forsyth says, but he knows it "for the very power and irony of God". This Cross, God's gracious act, became Forsyth's final security. Why?

> First, I know that God has made life out of my shipwreck. That is my experience. He has opened my grave and made me live. . . .
>
> For the second thing I know is this, that, according to the mind of Christ, and the experience of His apostles in every age, I have only been saved by something which, in the same act, also saved the world. It took a world's salvation to save me. . . .
>
> And this God has told and moved me how to act. He has told me to treat every man as saveable; therefore every man is saveable . . . I can only go on to my salvation if I recognize that God in saving me has charged Himself with the salvation of my kind, and put some of the responsibility on me.[20]

Not only had God rescued Forsyth and made him into the new man, but He had also made it plain to him that such a revolution was available to all men. This gave Forsyth one of the touchstones for an understanding of ethics—one must have concern for mankind not because mankind is inherently good, but because God looks upon mankind as saveable; not worthy of salvation, but nevertheless to be given the gracious gift of salvation.

8. Another thing which this experience did to Forsyth was to *lay a charge or a commission on him*. He turned his emphasis from classical study to theological study, to an attempt to interpret and mediate the Gospel in a way which would be relevant to the needs of men. In the following quotation can be noted not only this fact, but also the new sense in which Forsyth came to feel that he was no longer going out on uncharted waters, but was one who had the sure guidance of the Holy Spirit.

> Meantime my own course seemed prescribed. It was, in the space of life, strength and work which was yet mine, to labour as one who waited for that messianic hope, and to try to persuade those who would hear to join me in preparation for so great a gift of God. I withdrew my prime attention from much of the scholar's work and gave it to those theological interests, inbibed first from Maurice, and then more mightily from Ritschl, which come nearer to life than science, sentiment or ethic can ever do. I immersed myself in the Logic of Hegel, and corrected it by the theology of Paul, and its continuity in the Reformation, because I was all the time being corrected and humiliated by the Holy Spirit.[21]

20 *Missions in State and Church*, pp. 340-1.
21 *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind*, p. 195.

Forsyth thus came to stand in the great evangelical continuity of St. Paul and the Reformation, with a gospel to proclaim which was not his own, not something which he had "thought through" and worked into a satisfactory "philosophy of life". He was now a channel through whom, however Forsyth might blur the message, God was to speak.

9. A final thing to be noted is that in going through this gradual "about face", *Forsyth retained in his thought the best of liberalism*. He did not repudiate the solid gains which liberal theology had brought, and become an obscurantist.

> My faith in critical methods is unchanged. My acceptance of many of the new results is as it was. This applies to the criticism of traditional dogma not less than of scripture. But the need of the hour, among the only circles I can reach, is not that. . . . What is needed is no mere change of view, but a change and deepening in the type of personal religion, amounting in cases to a new conversion.[22]

To become an exponent of the positive Gospel, in other words, meant no dulling of the critical faculties, no drawing in of the reaches upon which the mind may and must speculate. It simply meant that such critical thought was conducted in terms of a new centre of orientation. This point must be insisted upon, both against those who would confuse Forsyth's thought with the old-line orthodoxy, and against those who would feel that he had conceded the Gospel to "new thought". Neither is the case. In the field of Biblical criticism, to take the most obvious example, Forsyth welcomed and accepted all of the solid gains of higher criticism, on the one hand; and insisted, on the other, that criticism was the handmaid of faith.

Forsyth was thus prepared by this whole experience not only to speak the Word of God with power, but to speak it with relevance, and as a result of his own inner testing he emerged with the clarity, the assurance and the conviction which mark all of his mature theological writing.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 195.

CONSCIENCE, GUILT AND EXPIATION: Some Notes on Dostoievsky

By Geraint V. Jones, M.A., B.Litt.

I

Literature (and especially fiction) has been described as "man's exploration of man by artificial light, which is better than natural light because we can direct it where we want it".[1] This is particularly applicable to the work of Dŏstoievsky, with its strange chiaroscuro effect resulting in an apocalyptic picture of a dark, sinister world drenched in light. "What interests him", John Cowper Powys wrote in a brilliant essay on Dostoievsky, "like a divine-demonic-obsession, is first and last the ultimate depths in the soul of spiritual good and spiritual evil",[2] and its illumination, in Berdyaev's vivid and haunting phrase, by the "light flashing on the frontier of the kingdom of light and the kingdom of darkness".[3] For the Dostoievskian spotlight illumines both kingdoms, brightening the light and illuminating the darkness as well as throwing it into deeper obscurity. Indeed, few of the great issues involved in man's destiny escape this apocalyptic illumination: atheism and Christianity, slavery and freedom, the self-destructiveness of modern Nietzschean man obsessed with power and egotism, the tension between *agape* and *eros,* the anguish of *eros,* the appalling nemesis on that humanism which, as Berdyaev observed, leads to anti-humanism, and the tormenting, expiatory consequences of guilt. J. C. Powys has called *The Brothers Karamazov* the "fifth Gospel"; and so it is: the apocalyptic gospel. It reveals through strange, oblique vistas both the manifest behaviour and the hidden depths of the soul; for Dostoievsky gives us such glimpses into the tumultuous, unbridled world of the unconscious that we may wonder if Freud was really as original as he is thought to be. Dostoievsky was an intuitive psychologist who realized fully the significance of dreams as psychological mechanisms twenty years and more before Freud wrote his *Interpretation of Dreams.*

In his concern with *agape,* freedom, moral responsibility and psychological dualism there is a penetrating Pauline quality; yet it is St. John's Gospel which figures so often in the pages of his novels, as when Sonia reads to Raskolnikov the story of the

1 Prof. David Daiches, *A Study of Literature,* Oxford, 1948, p. 24.
2 *The Pleasures of Literature,* p. 98.
3 In *The Divine and the Human.*

raising of Lazarus and Father Païssy the account of the miracle at Cana of Galilee.

Although Dostoievsky's immensè novel-sequence *The Life of a Great Sinner* was not finished, the completed part, *The Brothers Karamazov,* is so vast in scope and profound in depth, so overwhelming in its portrayal of sacred and profane love and those subtle, stinging, irritating moods of sadism and masochism, so challenging in its discourse of the things of heaven and hell, that many consider it to be the greatest novel ever written. Certainly I cannot think of one greater in its multidimensionality. Tolstoy's *War and Peace?* Proust's *Remembrance of Things Past?* Thomas Mann's *The Magic Mountain?* Dreiser's *American Tragedy?* or Jakob Wassermann's *The World's Illusion?* All have something in common with it. They have greatness, but lack some dimension present in *The Brothers Karamazov.* In the first there is immense spatial extent; in the second minute penetration in time without the breadth and moral depth; in Mann's novel there is the same kind of dialectic, a similar interest in abnormal psychology but less sense of ultimacy and vastness; Dreiser's novel lacks the universality of the greatest fiction, and Wassermann's immense range and moral seriousness, his concern with guilt and atonement, his interest in various manifestations of *eros,* owe much to Dostoievsky. (It was he who introduced the work of the great Russian to the poet Rilke.) Perhaps Berdyaev, who owed so much to him, comes nearest to him, though he was a philosopher, not an artist. He, too, wrote about the laceration of anguish, the primacy of freedom, expressed a similar hatred of collective man, and knew something of the demonism of evil.

In Dostoievsky's presentation of *eros, agape,* guilt, and expiation, there is something more than life-size. "I have my own special view on reality in art", he wrote to Strakhov; "what the majority call almost fantastic and exceptional sometimes signifies for me the very essence of reality". Indeed, in all his greatest work there is a fantastic quality: those back-stairs scenes, broken fences, muddy lanes; the sensuality of the Karamazovs; the neuroticism of Nastasia Philippovna in *The Idiot*; the self-destructive nihilism of the destroyers in *The Possessed*; Ivan's fever-dream about the devil; the terrible realism of *The House of the Dead*; the dreams which reveal the equally fantastic, twisted world of the unconscious: all are set out with the queer Byzantine slant of an El Greco picture. In *The Brothers Karamazov* are handled issues whose discussion could have filled a dozen treatises. I shall confine myself to one of them: Dostoievsky's treatment of conscience, guilt, and expiation.

The most obvious starting-point is *Crime and Punishment* (or, to give it its German title in translation, *Guilt and Expiation*). The problem is familiar: has a man the right to destroy a loathsome human being—"vermin", as Raskolnikov says to Sonia—not merely to rid the world of such a creature but to demonstrate the Nietzschean superiority of the destroyer? Raskolnikov's thesis is that there are men for whom moral laws do not exist; they have the right to commit crime; they are the extraordinary men. The crime is committed, and throughout the remainder of the novel we are shown its effect upon the criminal who is, in this case, psychologically a split personality. Pressure is exerted from without by the investigating lawyer and from within by the operation of conscience, each in a manner conceived with great psychological subtlety and insight.

The crime is apparently committed without a twinge of conscience. Only the remarkable dream about the flogging to death of an old horse shows that beneath the surface the repressed sense of guilt is fermenting, though it shocks Raskolnikov on waking without deterring him from committing the murder. Immediately the act has been done (perhaps as a result of the latent guilt being made manifest through the dream) conscience begins to trouble the murderer, who develops neurotic symptoms and asks, "Can this be the punishment already beginning"? He begins to suffer from hallucinatory obsessions and imagines that his clothes are saturated with blood. In one delirious dream he calls for his boot upon which he lavishes a kind of fetishistic attention; on another occasion the distinction between dream and reality is blurred and he experiences auditory hallucinations, imagining that his landlady has been beaten. Like Ivan Karamazov, who is troubled by his moral responsibility for his father's murder, Raskolnikov, easily identifiable as a schizoid and introvert type, is plunged into a neurotic delirium (the analogy with Shakespeare's *Macbeth* comes naturally to mind), and this has the effect of making his repressed sense of guilt more articulate as the tale progresses.

Fear of raving, an ambivalent sense of security and insecurity ("What if I killed the woman"? he asks Zametoff), the morbid fascination of what he has done, the unconscious automatism of his walk back to the scene of the murder, coincidental happenings such as the fatal accident to Marmeladoff whom he assists ("You are wet with blood". Raskolnikov: "Yes, I am all over blood"), his turning pale when his sister Dounia says (without reference to him) that she is "guilty of no man's death", and his reactions to the magistrate's analysis of guilty behaviour, are moments in this deepening sense of guilt. Analysis, however, is not enough;

Dostoievsky uses all this as an illustration of his recurrent theme of redemption through suffering and the need for expiation or atonement, and takes the reader from the sphere of "laceration of the nerves" (his own phrase) to that of conscience. "The man who has a conscience", says Raskolnikov, "suffers whilst acknowledging his sin. That is his punishment—to say nothing of the galleys". "Suffering", he says later, "is part and parcel of extensive intelligence and a feeling heart. A man who is really great must suffer considerably here below". And in the conversation with Sonia he tries to justify his action; to which Sonia replies: "You must make atonement, so that you may be redeemed thereby". Raskolnikov expiates his crime by being sent to Siberia. Before his departure he has another delirium-dream which serves as a kind of cathartic mechanism. It is the unexplained dream about the Asiatic pestilence caused by intelligent microbes, which should, I believe, be interpreted as a dream-symbol of Raskolnikov's realization that intelligence divorced from morality brings judgment upon itself. After it he is at peace, which suggests that Dostoievsky introduced it with a definite purpose. Raskolnikov is reconciled to his suffering.

"There is no happiness in comfort", Dostoievsky wrote in his preliminary notes while thinking about *Crime and Punishment;* "happiness is bought by suffering. Man earns his happiness and always by suffering. By suffering, such is the law of our planet. But this immediate consciousness, felt in the process of living, is such a great joy, for which one may pay by years of suffering". "Suffering", the magistrate says to Raskolnikov, "is a good thing . . . Don't laugh at it; there's an idea in suffering". So Sonia suffers for the sin of her father; Raskolnikov suffers in order to expiate his crime.

II

In *The Brothers Karamazov,* a far more massive work than *Crime and Punishment,* Dostoievsky again concerns himself with the questions of guilt and expiation. Sensuality and greed engulf a family in a tragic fate and bring upon themselves an inevitable nemesis.

The issues, too, are much more complicated, and the art with which Dostoievsky presents them is more complex and subtle. Without going too deeply into this novel, so vast and apocalyptic in its range, the following aspects of guilt can be mentioned. There is the unbridled sensuality ("lacerations") of old Karamazov, which brings its ultimate judgment in his murder by his illegitimate son Smerdyakov, whose sinister part in the novel is comparable with that played by Svidrigailov in *Crime and Punishment*; the sensuality of Dmitri; and the intellectual cynicism

of Ivan. Both sons desire the death of their father: Dmitri, so that he may possess his mistress Grushenka, and Ivan, in order to obtain his money. Here is the material of a Greek tragedy, and over it hangs a classical gloom broken only by the contrast provided by Alyosha and the old priest. Smerdyakov is immediately guilty of Karamazov's death, but the circumstantial evidence is such that Dmitri is judged to be guilty and is sent to Siberia. Ivan feels morally guilty. "If it is not Dmitri but Smerdyakov who is the murderer", he says, "I share his guilt, for I put him up to it. Whether I did, I don't know yet. But if he is the murderer, and not Dmitri, I, of course, am the murderer too".

The consequence of Ivan's "guilt" is a nervous collapse issuing in the famous hallucinatory dialogue with the Devil, which the Zurich psychiatrist, Dr. Eugen Frey, regards as a typical neurotic manifestation taking the form of a conscience-dream and by no means infrequent in his own clinical experience[4]: a remarkably accurate psychological presentation of the subconscious objectifying itself to Ivan through the vision of his own "double"—again a favourite conception of Dostoievsky's. Ivan, too, shares in the guilt of his father's murder, though he did not commit it. The conscience-conflict results in a grave neurotic condition.

The case of Dmitri is more subtle. He planned his father's death, which was carried out not by himself but by another. Was he therefore morally responsible? The same theme was used by Theodore Dreiser in *An American Tragedy,* where Clyde Griffiths plans to murder Roberta by drowning her in a lake. Her death happens exactly as planned—but by accident. As in Dostoievsky's novel, the circumstantial evidence is such that Griffiths is held guilty of murder. Was he guilty or not? A similar question of guilt is also debated with brilliant dialectic in Jakob Wassermann's *The Maurizius Case*[5].

Elsewhere in *The Brothers Karamazov* there is the story of the mysterious visitor who committed murder in such a way that suspicion fell upon a servant who was judged guilty but died before conviction. The stranger, now married, is consumed by remorse, and wishes to expiate his crime. "I want to suffer . . . I shall expiate everything by this secret agony", he tells Father Zossima, but when, at the latter's suggestion, he confesses his crime, nobody believes him, and the psychological reaction of his sense of guilt is such that he dies. Here again guilt is followed by expiation.

[4] *Das menschliche Gewissen nach F. M. Dostojewski . . . im Lichte der tiefenpsychologischen Forschung* (The human conscience in Dostoievsky . . . in the light of depth-psychology), *Schweizer Archiv für Neurologie und Psychiatrie,* Zurich, 1946. Cf. also the similar fever-dream at the end of Wassermann's novel *The Goose Man* (Eng. trans. Allen and Unwin).

[5] Eng. trans., Allen & Unwin (1930).

III

In *The Possessed* Dostoievsky deals with another variant of the guilt-theme, and in this difficult and prolix novel reveals perhaps more than elsewhere his remarkable prophetic insight into the spiritual and political ills of an age which he did not live to see. The Possessed (or the Devils) are the moral and political nihilists, the Nietzschean-Napoleonic men, Raskolnikov carried to the logical conclusion—Kirillov, Shatov, Stavrogin, Verhovensky, and Shigalov. They intend to abolish God and to destroy society in order that all values may be transvalued (in Nietzschean phrase) and society rebuilt according to their own ideas. Stavrogin finds equal pleasure in the enjoyment of beauty and of cruel obscenity. Kirillov has "no higher belief than disbelief in God". "To recognize that there is no God and not to recognize at the same time that one is God oneself is an absurdity". Shigalovism is the reduction of all to anarchistic equality, the abolition of equality and culture, the radical revolution of destruction preliminary to radical, godless reconstruction. "We are going to make such an upheaval that everything will be uprooted from its foundation". This is Nazism, Leninism, the rule of the mob, the revolt of the sub-man, the abolition of God and consequently of morality. "For if there is no everlasting God", Smerdyakov says in *The Brothers Karamazov,* "there is no such thing as virtue". "Starting from unlimited freedom", Shigalov says, "I end with unlimited despotism". On all this there is judgment; this moral nihilism has to be expiated. Kirillov and Stavrogin commit suicide, Shatov is murdered, Stavrogin's wife is murdered, and others are drawn down into the funnel and perish. With uncanny insight Dostoievsky foresaw the course of all revolutions of destruction as well as their long-term consequences. Evil brings with it the sense of guilt which must be atoned for or expiated: such seems to be the theme which runs through Dostoievsky's greatest novels.

IV

Dostoievsky anticipated many of the insights of Freud[6]. I mean by this that he possessed a profound intuitive insight into unconscious mental processes and the operation of latent impulses and their expression in dreams and other manifestations of the unconscious. He saw in dreams the evidence of emotional conflicts and used them as part of his artistic method of describing them. In the dream about the flogged horse, for example, Raskolnikov is shocked into realizing that an emotional conflict is in progress; shortly afterwards, and before committing the murder, he dreams that he is in an oasis drinking water from a fresh spring. The

[6] Who has written an illuminating essay on him.

result of this peaceful dream is the opposite of the first, for he is no longer a criminal but a tired wanderer in the desert; he has overcome the conscience-scruples whose repression becomes vivid in the first dream, is emotionally at rest, and carries out his intention without hesitation.

It is clear that, from their use in the novels and from his own comments on dreams through the thoughts of his characters, Dostoievsky was alive to their psychological significance. In *A Raw Youth* Arkady has an unpleasant dream about a spider spinning its web inside him. "This dream", he says, "proves that in my heart all these things were already germinating; they were there in my desires, but in the waking state my heart was ashamed of them and did not dare to realize anything of the sort consciously. In the dream, however, my soul revealed what was in my heart and showed it in the vivid images of truth". And in the short story *The Dream of a Ridiculous Man* we read this:

> Dreams, as everyone knows, are strange phenomena; some things present themselves with terrifying clarity with details as minute as those in a jeweller's work, and one leaps over others without even noticing, over space and time, for instance. It seems that dreams spring from the desires and not from the intellect, from the heart and not the head . . .

Dostoievsky knew as well as any modern psychiatrist that the dream is often a more accurate explanation of a person's actions than his conscious thoughts. Hence the prominence which he gives to dreams in his treatment of the workings of conscience.

It is through dream-analysis that we are able, in many cases, to understand the mental movements of his characters. In an unpublished chapter of *The Possessed,* for example, Stavrogin has a recurrent dream about a child. The explanation is that he has violated a little child, and his dream expresses his repressed sense of guilt; he also sees the Devil (rather like Ivan Karamazov), who confronts him with his ugliness and sin. We have mentioned Ivan Karamazov's famous conversation with the Devil, which, according to Dr. Frey, is "actually a struggle of the conscience to overcome the power of evil", about which he further writes as follows:

> From the purely medical and clinical-psychological standpoint this is a masterpiece. It clearly has to do with a fever-hallucination at the beginning of what in contemporary parlance was called a nervous fever but which is nowadays diagnosed as *typhus abdominalis,*

and adds that during an illness he himself had a similar experience, and was able to induce one in a neurotic patient by means of hypnotic treatment.

While, however, Dostoievsky made use of the dream in order

to release the repressed sense of guilt, this was not its only purpose. On at least two important occasions dreams of which the dreamer becomes conscious on awaking are the means of the release of intolerable emotional tension. In *The Brothers Karamazov* Aloysha, who has been emotionally shocked by the death of the old priest Zossima and by the "breath of corruption", falls asleep in his cell while Father Paissy reads the story of the miracle at Cana of Galilee. As a result of the dream the emotional conflict is released, and Aloysha has a profound mystical experience of union with the cosmos. Towards the end of the novel, too, Dmitri is on the verge of a total nervous collapse after the long preliminary investigation of the murder. He falls asleep and dreams about a derelict peasant family and a weeping baby who evoke his sympathy. This, again, is an emotionally cathartic dream which enables him to overcome his suffering through the representation of sympathy. During this dream he "felt that a passion of pity such as he had never known before was rising in his heart", and at the moment of awaking he hears Grushenka telling him of her love for him. The dream is described in great detail[7], and after it is over Dmitri experiences a strange emotional peace. This dream also is a conscience-dream.

V

Dostoievsky, then, through the medium of his art, which he manipulates with consummate skill and psychological insight, reaches a moral intensity unmatched by any other great novelist. In his novels he seems to ask two main questions: What is the character and extent of our moral responsibility? Can we ultimately escape the consequences of guilt? Involved in his presentation of these questions are further questions about God, freedom, and immortality. Whether I am reading too much into his novels or not I do not know; but it seems clear enough that, unless he stands wholly outside the world which he has described, he rejects both the socialism which destroys freedom and the humanism which supplants God. Ivan Karamazov's legend of the Grand Inquisitor is not only an indictment of Western Catholicism but also of totalitarianism in any form, and in the three novels which have come under brief review Dostoievsky exposes the destructive potency of the demonic forces (the irruption of the abysmal, as Tillich describes them) which threaten to disrupt society. Because man is free, he is responsible for their release, and must therefore expiate through suffering (his own or someone else's) the harm that he does. And this is a consequence inherent in a universe which is to be thought of as a moral order.

[7] pp. 546-8 of Constance Garnett's translation (Heinemann).

SCRAP BOOK FOR 1900

By James Phillips, F.R.C.S.

I came to Bradford in 1900 to take up the post of Senior House Surgeon at the (now demolished) old Royal Infirmary. Queen Victoria was then on the throne. Many of the amenities which today are regarded as essential and commonplace had not even been thought of half a century ago. There were no cinemas, no radio, no stainless steel, no safety razors, no internal combustion engined vehicles; the electrical gadgets—vacuum cleaners, fires, washing machines, water heaters, refrigerators—which every modern household now can have, were not then available. Baden Powell was still besieged in Mafeking so that there were no Boy Scouts or Girl Guides. Very few houses had electric light. Most of the old town houses were lit with gas; in a few of the older houses paraffin lamps were being used. Lamps were the general mode of lighting in country homes—that is, in living rooms. At bed-time a row of candles in saucer-shaped candlesticks, fitted usually with snuffers, was to be found on the hall table. Each occupant of the house would light his candle and take it with him upstairs to his bedroom; and so to bed.

As recently as 1939, when the Infirmary Governors bought a mid-Victorian Hall in order to convert it into a nurses' home, the gas fittings which had been put in when the building was erected nearly a century ago were still functioning—a tribute to the solid workmanship of the Victorian era.

Road transport in 1900 was by horse or on foot. It was in 1900 that the first electric underground railway—The Twopenny Tube—was opened in London. When in 1898, I went from Bristol to London to take the *viva voce* part of my final medical examination, my train arrived late at Paddington Station. I was then overdue at Examination Hall on the Thames Embankment. The quickest means available to get me there was a hansom cab. Fortunately, my examiners were kind, and I was allowed to enter for the examination.

In 1900, if a family had planned to go by train for a seaside holiday, someone, on the day before the setting off, would call at the railway station to engage a growler, a four-wheel cab driven by a jarvey wearing a top hat and whose clothes smelled of stables, to call the following day to take the travellers and their luggage to the station.

People fifty years ago were accustomed to walk. One of the first patients I had to attend at the Infirmary was a maid-servant. Her mistress, on going downstairs one morning, noticed that the maid looked very ill. In those days every subscriber to the Hospital fund of an annual guinea became entitled to 'recommend' a patient for hospital treatment. The mistress gave the maid the required form and told her to take it to the Infirmary, where in due course she arrived. She was found to be suffering from a ruptured stomach ulcer, one of the most pain- and shock-producing conditions known. She had walked some three miles from Shipley to Bradford in this state, a feat of physical endurance such as, if done by a soldier in battle, might very properly have earned him mention in despatches.

At the Infirmary in 1900 there was no X-ray apparatus. The surgeon did whatever class of operation was necessary. There were no 'specialists' on the staff. The surgeons were all engaged in general practice: with one exception so also were the medical officers. Private operations were done in the patients' homes. Not long ago I was stopped in the street by a man who said "You won't know me. In 1902, when I was a schoolboy, you came to our house in Girlington and operated on the kitchen table on my sister for a perforation of her stomach. I just wanted to tell you that she is alive and is very well".

In 1902 I became the partner, in general practice, of Dr. Handcock, and for several years I visited my patients riding a bicycle. My partner regularly did his rounds in a hansom cab. His joy, when not too busy to do so, was to get into riding clothes in an afternoon and pay visits on horseback to patients who lived at some distance from the surgery. During all the years that I was his colleague he wore on his daily rounds a top hat and a tail coat. Most Bradford doctors at this time were still wearing the frock coat; and so were some of the older generation of business men. The key-note of the time was dignity. On Sunday top hat and frock coat was church-going apparel for most men. One of the private jokes in my family concerned an uncle—a six footer—who was an elder of the kirk, one of whose duties it was to stand on Sunday in the church porch by the collection plate. He had no occasion on weekdays to wear a frock coat, but on the Sabbath he donned a below-the-knee length broadcloth frock coat and a shining 'topper'. The joke related to one Sunday morning when, thus attired, he strode with wife and family to church, and when just about to enter the sacred building, one of his young people noticed that, like Kipps on a memorable occasion, her father was wearing carpet slippers.

In 1900 few telephones existed. A majority of the Infirmary physicians and surgeons had no telephone installed at their homes. You literally *sent* for the doctor in those days. You did not telephone. If, during the night, a messenger arrived at the doctor's house, he would find by the front door a speaking tube and a pull-bell—electric bells were non-existent. Having pulled the bell, which rang in the doctor's bedroom, the messenger waited until a voice speaking down the tube enquired what he wanted. He spoke into the tube, telling who was ill and giving the necessary address. My partner was accustomed to use a high falsetto voice on such occasions, which enabled him, if he thought fit, to inform the messenger that the doctor was not available. A story, which has lost its point today, used to be told of an occasion on which a doctor's wife, using a speaking-tube and after a whispered conference with her husband, told the messenger that the doctor was not at home. The messenger, however, had overheard the whisperings, and his reply was, "O well, if the doctor is not at home, send the man who is up there with you, he'll do".

Incidentally, in 1900 there were no twin beds, and pyjamas had not begun to be worn. Men and women alike wore nightgowns. Women's clothes were ample and solid—constructed to wear well and to last for a long time. Skirts for outdoor were ankle length; indoor skirts swept the floor. Several petticoats were worn; for afternoon wear these were usually frilly and lacy. This was not for show, but for the wearer's inner satisfaction—"our outer garments", a girl would be instructed, "indicate our social standing. Our underclothes show more than that. They show that we are genteel to our skins." But the lower limbs must be thoroughly shrouded. Women played tennis in long frocks. Bathing costumes were bulky and covered the wearer from neck to ankle. Mixed bathing was not allowed. The bathing places on the shore at Rothesay for men and for women were separated by nearly a quarter of a mile. A girl was deemed to have arrived at womanhood when she "put her hair up, and put her skirts down". Short skirts did not come into fashion until nearly the end of the first world war. A soldier returning from the Far East in 1920 after some years spent abroad, when asked what most struck him as different, replied, "The light-coloured stocking-clad legs of the women".

Anyone who is interested in social conditions as they were in Bradford in the late Victorian era will find graphic descriptions in the early novels of Oliver Onions, whose family were Congregationalists and worshipped at Horton Lane Congregational Church, Bradford, where, about 1900, Oliver had just ceased to be a Sunday School scholar. In *Little Devil Doubt* there is a

description of a dance arranged by Mason's printing firm. The guests were each furnished with a programme which had a list of dances, and opposite each dance a space for the initials of the chosen partner. A chief duty of the Master of Ceremonies was to see that even the shyest girl had her programme filled. For in 1900 a dance was a social function where the etiquette required that every man present should request the honour of a dance from as many girls as possible. The interchange of partners was a large part of the fun and the pleasure—"the joy of life is what will happen next: it keeps me guessing".

In 1900 society was more definitely divided into different grades than it is today. Although Queen Victoria was all but worshipped by the British people and although King Edward VII was popular with all classes, Royalty kept aloof, and the King was unknown personally to all except members of the aristocracy, or the horse racing or yacht racing fraternities. Fraternizings such as George VI, when a prince, had with Boy Scouts in their camps would never have been thought possible in 1900. Henry Nevinson, a journalist who for many years represented some of the principal newspapers as foreign correspondent, tells of an interview that, at the suggestion of the then Prime Minister, Campbell Bannerman, he had in 1906 with King Edward VII. Trouble had been threatening between Russia and Finland. Nevinson had recently returned from Finland and it was arranged that he should go to Buckingham Palace to impart his information to the King in person. "Dress", he wrote, "was my chief difficulty. The King was very particular about dress; above all, I must wear a top hat. . . . Splendidly mendacious, Vaughan Nash (of the Foreign Office) detached his own top hat from a peg, and we polished it with a silk handkerchief till it almost shone. But it was far too small for my head. I had to carry it in my hand until, coming within range of the sentries at the Palace gates, I made shift to jam it over my forehead lest they should think me insane. Having thus safely eluded their bayonets, I arrived at the front door and rang the electric bell. The door was opened by a paragon of princedom such as would delight a child in a fairy tale—thickly powdered hair, fine impressive countenance, brilliant scarlet coat from neck to knee, a gleam of gold somewhere, exquisite primrose breeches, white silk stockings, and the daintiest shoes with shining buckles. Gulping down my astounded awe, and remembering that, like Virgilian heroes, I had suffered things more dread, I asked, 'Is the King at home, please?' and, fixing his imperturbable eyes through my head upon a point far down the Mall, the glorified figure uttered the words, 'His Majesty is expecting you, Sir', and I followed him through the royal portals. I was noiselessly ushered

into a comfortable sort of study, furnished with ordinary leather arm-chairs and writing table. The gorgeous apparition withdrew and, through a hidden door in the opposite wall, an equerry emerged in undress uniform. To his questions I answered that the Tsar had commanded two army corps to mobilize on the frontiers of Finland for the invasion of the Duchy. The equerry listened attentively and ran back into the room behind the hidden door, whence I presently heard deep guttural sounds proceeding, mysterious and obscure as though an oracle spoke. Back came the equerry with more questions, and back he ran with my replies. After this to and fro of communication between the Sovereign and a mere journalist had been repeated a few times the equerry stood still and said, 'The King asks if you have anything further you would wish to say?', and I replied, 'I should like to ask the King to write a personal letter to the Tsar, warning him that, if he wishes to conclude the proposed agreement with the English people, as I believe the King also desires, the invasion of Finland with two army corps would be a bad beginning'. Away trotted the equerry and again I heard the gutteral notes of the voice that rocked the Empire. Back came the equerry and said, 'The King cannot make any such promise, as it would be interfering with the affairs of a friendly Power, but he thanks you for your information'. I bowed, and conducted by the glorious apparition, I retraced my steps until I emerged once again into the common air and could walk at ease back to Downing Street where I restored the little top hat to its owner and its peg''.

When in 1901 Edward became King he, in various ways, set the fashion. Before he was crowned he was operated on for appendicitis—a word quite unknown to non-medical people before that event. Since then, the operation for the removal of a diseased appendix has been performed more frequently than all other surgical operations added together. In 1900 Windsor Castle was lit by candles and oil lamps. When Edward became king he had electric light installed. Workmen spent months in the Castle boring through walls, some of them five feet thick, in order to do the necessary wiring. In 1905 the King bought his first limousine, and thereafter began the fashion of replacing horse carriages by motor cars.

In pre-motor car days one classification of Society was into carriage folk and cottage folk. To become the owner of a horse and carriage was evidence of financial success in life. A Bradford brewer who had 'made his pile' bought a house with stabling attached, and on most fine afternoons he and his wife might have been seen driving to town and back—'showing off' this was called by envious fellow-citizens. The carriage was an open landau in

which two short and very stout, proud people sat behind a top-hatted coachman in uniform. Mr. G. had his new home painted and decorated 'regardless of cost'. Above the door in the drawing room, where the former owner's crest had been painted, the decorator was instructed to paint a beer-barrel. Beer it was that had made it possible for Mr. G. to reach his present state; therefore, let his crest be a beer barrel!

Domestic service 50 years ago was a skilled profession. A girl, leaving school at the age of thirteen, whose mother had very likely been herself in service before her marriage, would go as a 'tweeny' or kitchen maid to a house where several servants were kept. After general training she would decide which special department she would go into—parlour maid, cook, or lady's maid. The lady's maids regarded themselves as of a better class than shop assistants or factory workers—certainly, as a rule they were more neatly dressed, both on and off duty, and more ladylike in their behaviour and bearing. Sir Charles Dilke, on one occasion, was asked who, in his experience, he considered possessed the most perfect manners. Without hesitation he named the personal maid of one of his lady friends.

Recently a young woman who had been entertaining troops in Korea is reported to have said: "Our boys are living in tents with no radio and no entertainment. Boredom is the chief enemy". In 1900 there was no radio and no cinema. But folks did not suffer from boredom on that account. They made their own amusements. Musical evenings were common, when perhaps a dozen or more friends were invited, each being asked to bring his or her music. The music was left in its case with the outdoor clothes in the hall, but in confident faith that during the evening the hostess would call upon its owner. Nearly every girl could play the piano, some played the violin, others sang. Both in homes and institutions young folks were happy entertaining themselves and their friends. Churches and Chapels, in addition to being temples of worship, were, to a much greater extent than they are nowadays, social community centres where young people got to know each other—often betrothals followed. In big hospitals such as St. Luke's and the Royal Infirmary at Bradford the nurses' common rooms were, night after night, homes of music and merriment, where happy girls played and sang and danced and worked with their needles. I still possess prized examples of embroidery and other forms of skilled needlework dating back to the early years of this century.

Three characteristic features of the period were solidity, security, certitude.

Money was solid. Pound notes did not exist. Gold was the standard of value. Banks were compelled by law to possess gold sufficient to enable them to meet their obligations. A firm employing a number of workpeople would procure from the bank the necessary supply of sovereigns and half-sovereigns to pay the weekly wages. And at the bank the coins would be, not counted out, but weighed on a scale. A drawer full of sovereigns would be opened and a special type of shovel used to scoop up the coins. Stout linen bags suitably labelled were used to carry the gold.

There were several ceremonial occasions on which ladies were accustomed to 'leave cards'. After a formal dinner party each lady guest, within seven days, would pay an after-dinner call to thank her hostess and 'leave cards'—one of her own for the hostess, and two of her husband's, one for the hostess and one for the host. When a new-comer came into a district the neighbouring ladies would each pay a duty call and leave cards. The new-comer would return the call. After that, the acquaintance would either ripen or lapse. But the call and the return call were *de rigueur*. Another occasion for leaving cards was the At Home Day. On one corner of a lady's visiting card would be printed some such words as "Second Tuesday" or "First Friday". On this day of each month the lady would have her drawing room specially swept and garnished. Both she and her parlour-maid would be particularly carefully gowned. The ladies of her visiting circle would arrive round about 4 p.m., have a cup of tea and sit and chat. After half an hour or so, the less intimate acquaintances would say their adieux. Some familiar friends might remain for an intimate gossip. Ladies as a class in those days were workers, and they would knit or sew or embroider as they chatted.

In 1900 money was not only solid, but its purchasing power was tremendous compared with the present day. In 1951, replying to a parliamentary question, Mr. Gaitskell, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, stated that a £1,000 income was only equal to £256 in 1914 purchasing power. A few examples of 1900 prices may be quoted from Macqueen-Pope's book, *Twenty Shillings in the Pound*. A youth's ready-made suit cost a pound; an overcoat fifteen shillings. A woman's ready-made costume could be bought for ten and sixpence, and its skirt then had enough material to make two dresses of today. Garments were made with abundant turn-overs and hems, so that should the wearer grow in girth or height, they could be altered to suit the new dimensions. Kid gloves cost two and elevenpence three farthings and for the odd farthing you got a packet of pins. New copyright novels cost four and sixpence; well printed, cloth-bound classics could be got for a shilling. Publishers vied with each other in publishing standard

works in sixpenny editions. W. T. Stead published generous *Selections from the Poets,* and a large variety of *Books for the Bairns* at one penny each.

When, in those years, I was accustomed to spend a holiday week in London, a seat in the pit of a West End theatre cost half a crown. Nor was it necessary to go to London to see 'stars' of the theatre. The records of the old Bradford Theatre Royal will show that the most famous actors and actresses of the day regularly appeared there. From a seat in the gallery—for which I believe I paid one shilling—I saw Henry Irving playing in *The Bells.* It was after playing Beckett at Bradford Theatre Royal that Irving had a heart attack and died in the Bradford Midland Hotel.

But I think a better idea of the purchasing value of money fifty years ago can be got from reading an extract or two from the published diaries of the widow of "Scott of the Antarctic". In 1906 Kathleen Bruce (as she then was), a girl in her twenties, set out to earn her living in London as a sculptor. "I acquired", she writes, "a small third floor in Cheyne Walk for £16 a year. That left me £56 a year. A good old woman in the next street came for half a crown a week to do my rooms every morning and for fourpence would bring me a plateful of her family's hot dinner at mid-day". Some years later her diary records: "For the first time in my life I have overdrawn my banking account. It gives me sensations as if I were going down in a lift every time I think of it".

In 1900 the science of economics both for the individual and for the nation was, both in theory and in practice, of a simple kind. Money was earned—it was the reward for services rendered. One got as much as one could for these services, and was entitled to spend only the money which was thus made available. Income and expenditure must balance. However keen one might be to possess some desired article, one must do without it unless and until one had the necessary funds; to do otherwise would be not only unwise but dishonest. And, similarly, Chancellors of the Exchequer were agreed that common-sense and common honesty alike demanded that the national income and expenditure must be made to balance.

The workman's wages in money in 1900 were woefully low. But it is arguable that as real wages they would bear comparison with today's figures. You will notice that Kathleen Bruce's charlady had a hot dinner prepared daily for her family and was able to give Kathleen her dinner at the cost of fourpence.

One of my patients was accustomed on Saturday nights to take a basket to the Market or to a poulterer and fruiterer's shop, where for two or three shillings he was able to purchase enough food to

feed his wife, himself and his four children over the week-end. There were no refrigerators in the shops in 1900, so that perishable foodstuffs had to be got rid of on Saturday at whatever prices could be got for them. It was when a worker was unemployed that hardship arose. Where the breadwinner was employed, by and large, there was not much hardship. Many of my patients had bought their homes and had saved up for a rainy day. It was always an astonishment to me how many working-class people, when surgical treatment was needed, insisted on going into a nursing home and paying for the operation and after-treatment rather than go into a public hospital.

Not only did goods cost much less 50 years ago, but the policy of making goods substantial and durable had the result that, once bought, an article lasted much lónger. Also, personal wants were fewer than they are today. Kathleen Bruce did her own hair—there were no permanent waves, or weekly hair settings to be paid for. There were no beauty parlours. 'Make up' was used only in a small way and never applied in public. Men used the cut-throat razor; the steady outlay on safety-razor blades was not called for. And of course an electric razor was not even dreamt of.

A second characteristic which I have suggested as prevalent in 1900 was a consciousness of security. How could it be otherwise? Except for minor episodes England had been at peace for nearly a century. Britain was an island, secure against invasion so long as the Navy ruled the waves. Except as a poetic dream of the great Victorian Poet Laureate, Alfred Tennyson, fighting in the air was inconceivable. And commercial supremacy was as secure as was the Bank of England or the British Constitution.

Along with solidarity and the sense of security, there was abounding certitude. Boys and girls grew up in an atmosphere in which it was taken for granted that England and everything English was perfection personified. England was the Land of Hope and Glory. God had made her mighty, and would no doubt make her mightier yet. In every foreign country the English sovereign had an exchange value of more than twenty shillings.

Certitude of religious belief was as much a characteristic of 1900 as certitude of England's pre-eminence. True, it was the time when R. J. Campbell in Brighton and Rhondda Williams in Bradford were preaching The New Theology. And Freethinkers were actively propagating their various forms of unbelief. But whatever the professed doctrine, it was expounded with profoundest conviction. Of a volume entitled *Freethinkers of the 19th Century* a reviewer wrote: "How fiercely in this period hope burned in the breast of the unbeliever. He doubts the significance of the universe but not the importance of his own conclusions. He

proclaims his unbelief with evangelical zeal''. When Thomas Hardy met Matthew Arnold in London he commented: ''Mr. Arnold had the manner of having made up his mind upon everything long ago''. For those whom Oliver Wendell Holmes calls the intellectual non-combatants, the authority of Holy Scripture was absolute. Providence set all doubts at rest.

I was carried back in memory to 1900 when, recently, one of my contemporaries, speaking of a husband and wife who had both became extensively paralysed by an attack of poliomyelitis, asserted her assured conviction, not only that this calamity was 'God's will' (the Christian variety of fatalism) but that it had been divinely pre-ordained and must turn out to be for the good of the afflicted couple.

It seems to me that the outstanding difference between 1900 and 1952 is not difference regarding things material. Rather it is that whereas formerly certitude, serenity, the conviction that everything was steadily and securely progressing towards perfection formed the background of the belief of the great mass of people, nowadays certainty and security have disappeared.

> It seemed as under the great globe I swung
> I knew some answer unambiguous.
> But that was long ago and I was young.

Fifty years ago Christian belief was generally held to provide the ''answer unambiguous'' to the mystery of evil. This, for many people, is so no longer. They feel neither certain nor secure, and will not till they find the satisfaction of their need at a deeper level than satisfied so many people fifty years ago.

REVIEWS

The reviews are in four divisions:

Theology and relevant studies: works of scholarship ranging from dogmatic theology and church history to psychology and cosmology.

Religion, life and work: books concerned with the daily application of religion and its popular exposition.

Miscellanea, a limited selection from current general literature.

Periodical publications.

THEOLOGY
AND RELEVANT STUDIES

God and Nature. By G. F. Stout. 339 pp. C.U.P. 35s.

In 1919 and 1921 Professor G. F. Stout delivered the Gifford Lectures in the University of Edinburgh. "Mind and Matter", published in 1931, and this book "God and Nature", are the two volumes of a complete work based on the lectures. But Stout died in 1944; and so the second volume has been put together from the MS. by his son Professor A. K. Stout.

"God and Nature" is packed with closely-reasoned detail, and any short account of it must therefore be very partial. But perhaps the essence of the argument may be stated without injustice to what has to be left out.

The fundamental position from which everything starts is the distinction and constant connection of Matter and Mind—though they are always together in experience neither is the other. But they are related. Mind knows matter—Matter is the object of mind.

Knowledge of the material world is of two kinds. It begins with *sensa*, or immediate presentations. But they reveal to us objects beyond themselves. This world of physical objects we know in a different way, which is not that of immediate sensuous intuition, but is by means of an ideal construction in which the elements have some resemblance to those of sensuous intuition, e.g., shape, size, etc. So we arrive at physical science. Stout regards both *sensa* and physical objects as material. But the one are known intuitively, the other more abstractly. But neither can do without the other. *Sensa* reveal physical objects. Physical objects explain *sensa*. This connection could not exist, unless each in its way was part of matter. If there were a mind that could know matter not partially or in aspect, but through and through, the whole of matter would be its *sensum* or presentation. Such a mind would be God.

It is in fact necessary to postulate God in order to explain the unity of the world, which both common sense and science assume. All our knowledge, whether sensuous or scientific, is incomplete. We always know with a background of the unknown. For God this background of our knowledge would not be unknown: it is His existence that explains the way in which the different parts of knowledge, whether in ourselves at different times and places, or in different selves, all join up in one system. The unity of the material world corresponds to the unity of Mind, which is God.

It is not necessary to think of God as creating matter, it is sufficient if He control it. He controls both *sensa* and physical objects This control results in a general teleology, so that even the inorganic world has an

immanent mentality. Out of this unconscious matter, however, under special conditions emerge the embodied finite selves, which are *ourselves*. Our mental life, like that of God, is conative. Our knowledge proceeds from conation as attention; but beyond that we strive to transform what we know. Working on the basis of the general teleology of the universe, we are guided by the idea of the good. But, as finite beings, we imagine the good in different ways, which conflict with one another. Thus evil arises. But the overall scheme of the Universe persists, and God brings good out of evil. He is omnipotent and omniscient as regards the general scheme, but not as regards what depends on our freedom. Christian theology recognizes the two aspects of the Divine Being as the Father and the Son in the Trinity. The one is above the struggle. The other joins in it.

"God and Nature" might be entitled alternatively "The Faith of a Psychologist". Its great merit is that it does fairly and squarely face the problems involved. One such problem is that of the relation between *sensa* and physical objects, which is the scandal of epistemology. Another is that of the relation between the omnipotence and omniscience of God and human freedom, which is the scandal of theology. No one will study "God and Nature" as it deserves to be studied without being compelled to think and indeed to think furiously on both these points ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Six Existentialist Thinkers. By H. J. BLACKHAM. 173 pp. Routledge and Kegan Paul. 15s.

Christian Doubt. By GEDDES MACGREGOR. 160 pp. Longmans. 15s.

So many books on Existentialism have appeared in the last few years that it is not without a feeling of satiety that a reviewer opens yet another. So let it be said right away that Mr. Blackham's book is different. Most introductions to this subject, in attempting to tell us what Existentialism is all about, achieve a deceptive clarity by presenting as a system a philosophy that declares war on all "systems". Important differences in outlook and emphasis between one thinker and another are necessarily ignored in an attempt to bring clearly to view the common ground on which they stand. There is a distorting of perspectives and an over-simplification of issues. This does not make such books valueless, of course, and some of them are very useful. But it does ensure a specially warm welcome for a book like Mr. Blackham's which expounds individual philosophers rather than "Existentialism". The philosophers expounded are Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Jaspers, Marcel, Heidegger, and Sartre, and the author's method is to devote a chapter to each thinker, outlining the main positions of his philosophy and illustrating the steps of the argument with ample quotations from one or two key works. Mr. Blackham believes that each thinker throws light on the others and that a study of them all, on the basis of his exposition of their philosophies, will help us to understand the real significance of a movement which is something more than a mere ephemeral fashion in philosophizing. He sees Existentialism as "reaffirming in a modern idiom the protestant or stoic form of individualism, which stands over against the empirical individualism of the Renaissance or of modern liberalism or of Epicurus as well as over against the universal system of Rome or of Moscow or of Plato". The reader may or may not go with the author in this, but he cannot fail to profit from a careful study of the book. The style is clear and vivid, and flows smoothly, with here and there the gleam of a memorable phrase. There are useful biographical and bibliographical notes together with an adequate index.

"To depend for one's life upon the object of a supreme choice and to lay hold of it with one hand, and with the other to hold on to its objective

uncertainty and to hang suspended between the two, that is the meaning of faith". This sentence of Mr. Blackham's, expounding Kierkegaard, might have served Professor MacGregor as a text or motto for the title page of his book, *Christian Doubt*. For his thesis is that all genuine faith is a choice between what William James used to call "live options", and that the rejected alternative does not just disappear, but remains present and active within the context of the whole experience to give precisely that element of risk which is inseparable from all faith worthy of the name. The thesis is worked out with many apt illustrations and the course of the working out takes us into unexpected places. A few of the chapter headings will show some of the topics that fall within the ambit of this unusual book—*Convention and Protest in Religion and in Irreligion; The Sin against the Holy Ghost; Faith, Doubt, and Laughter; Silence; The Disunity of Christendom;* and *Doubt as a Basis for Christian Reconciliation*. The book requires attentive reading, but the reader will be greatly stimulated; not least when he finds himself in violent disagreement with the author.

H. F. Lovell Cocks.

The Books of Kings. By James A. Montgomery. Edited by H. S. Gehman. 575 pp. T. and T. Clark. 35s.

The publication of this volume in the International Critical Commentary series is a major event in the world of Old Testament scholarship. It has all the features traditionally associated with the series. There is a large Bibliography. There is also a very useful chart of Biblical Chronology, written by the editor and inserted at the request of the late Prof. Montgomery.

The textual notes are separated from the commentary. This allows the non-Hebraist to make use of the commentary without distraction. The book will yield a rich reward in a fuller understanding both of the religion and history of Israel. A feature of the book is the clear treatment of historiography. He has wise things to say about the value of writings which we vaguely classify with such terms as Priestly or Prophetic or Historical. He shows too how intimately bound together are the theology and the history of Israel.

In a book of such range it is inevitable that there are points where an informed reader may disagree with the writer. But so far as this work is concerned this is confined to minor matters. For example, in his reference to what is sometimes called the "Myth and Ritual" school he rightly points out that the relation of the orientation of the axis of the Temple to the rising sun at the equinox does not necessarily imply sun-worship. It is a pity that he did not take the matter further and make some positive suggestion. His caution on the relation between the date of the Exodus and the building of the Temple is probably justified and he exhibits a masterly grasp of the complicated archaeological material. On the oft-discussed question of what happened at Megiddo when Josiah was put to death (II Kings, xxiii. 29) he is non-committal. He seems to justify his caution on the basis of the unsatisfactory state of the Hebrew text.

Apart from such minor criticisms the book is a most satisfactory piece of work. It is a pleasure, too, to handle a book so well produced.

James Wood.

The Epistle to the Ephesians. By C. Leslie Mitton. 346 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 30s.

The problem of the authorship of Ephesians is one of the most disputed questions in New Testament scholarship. This book is a contribution to that debate of the first importance. It consists of four parts. In Part I

Dr. Mitton deals with "The Findings of the Past", presenting the arguments which have been used for and against Pauline authorship, and giving a clear summary of Goodspeed's well known theory. Part II examines the relationship between Ephesians and Colossians, Part III that between Ephesians and other Pauline epistles, and Part IV discusses the date of Ephesians, and gives the conclusions.

Ephesians is sufficiently close to other Pauline epistles for considerations of vocabulary, style, and theology alone to be indecisive. Dr. Mitton therefore rightly bases his case mainly on literary considerations. He finds that the use of Colossians by Ephesians, which is characterized by conflation of different passages and by the use of identical words with different meanings, suggests that the latter is more probably the work of an imitator than of Paul himself. This is supported by the difference between the interdependence of Ephesians and other epistles, and that of Philippians and other epistles. The parallels between Ephesians and other epistles are not only twice as numerous as in the case of Philippians, but, far from being haphazard as in Philippians, are sustained and recurring, as if the author wished to repeat memorable phrases from the other letters.

Dr. Mitton's reconstruction of the origin of Ephesians resembles that of Goodspeed, though he does not follow his emphasis on the production of Acts in reviving interest in Paul. The epistle was written in the province of Asia about A.D. 90 by a disciple of Paul who, knowing intimately Colossians and also its companion note to Philemon, and coming later to know other letters of the apostle, wrote another as a summary of Paul's message, the revival of which he thought was much needed to counteract the contemporary diluted legalistic presentation of the Gospel. In this summary "the essential message of the Gospel would be declared quite apart from any practical difficulties or local problems with which it was so often entangled in the other letters". The pseudonymity is amply justified by the large use the author made of Paul's writings. "If we may not, in strict accuracy, call it the Epistle of Paul, we might term it 'The Gospel according to Paul' ".

One reader at least has been strengthened in his view that Ephesians is probably not by Paul. The burden of proof would now seem to be with the supporters of the traditional view. Fully to appreciate the force of the evidence Dr. Mitton presents it is necessary to study the six long and formidable appendices in which the parallels between Ephesians and other epistles are printed in columns (in Greek). This is emphatically not a suitable book to read for relaxation. But the reader who is prepared to take time and pains will find, by the time he has reached the admirably clear résumé of results, that he has read a book which, in seeking a solution to the problem of authorship, has thrown fresh light on the epistle itself as a most priceless document whose value is enhanced rather than diminished, if it is not by Paul, because we have then an additional witness to the one Gospel.

A. J. B. Higgins.

Gospel and Law. By C. H. Dodd. 83 pp. C.U.P. 9s. 6d.

These Bampton Lectures delivered at Columbia University in 1950 have for their sub-title *The Relation of Faith and Ethics in Early Christianity.* No subject is more relevant to our modern needs, for the days have long since gone when it could be assumed that although the dogmas of Christianity might cause perplexity, its ethical teaching was such as to arouse the admiration of all right thinking men. There are those who would reduce the Christian message to a sentimentalized version of the Sermon on the Mount; there are others who, in reaction from this, speak little of Christ's

teaching and relapse into an earlier "Paulinism" which ignores the ethical elements in Paul's teaching. Each generation has its own distinctive problems. In our age, as any one in close contact with earnest youth is aware, the most pressing problem is not the content of Christian truth but the relevancy of Christian ethics to modern life. Dr. Dodd's book is thus very welcome dealing as it does with the relation of Gospel and Law in the New Testament. This book (in spite of its price!) is only eighty pages long but it has a value out of all relation to its size. The reviewer finds himself in such close agreement with its views that instead of criticism he must be content with exposition.

The first lecture, *Preaching and Teaching in the Early Church* explores the "true organic relations" between the ethical and the religious content of Christianity, and deduces from the similarity in substance and form in the ethical teaching of the epistles of St Paul, Hebrews and I Peter the existence of a common *catechesis* in the early church. Lecture II, *Principles and Motives of Christian Ethics in the New Testament,* shows how within the "general pattern" of "practical precepts for everyday living" there are "certain specific points at which distinctively Christian motives or sanctions appear": "first, Christian eschatology; secondly, the idea of the 'Body of Christ'; thirdly, the imitation of Christ; and fourthly, the primacy of love or charity".

Lecture III, *The Ethical Teaching of the Gospels,* illustrates the influence of "the preliterary tradition of the teaching of Jesus" on the catechetical teaching of the church but there is this difference: "the sayings in the Gospels have an incomparably greater liveliness and pungency than the maxims in the *catechesis*", whilst the parables of Jesus have "a poetical and imaginative quality which is quite distinctive". "The precepts of Jesus, in judging us" not only "expose our need for forgiveness" but "in some sense" "are intended to constitute a new law". It is with *The Law of Christ* that the fourth lecture deals. Dr. Dodd protests against "the once popular view that Christianity is 'a religion of the spirit' in a sense which contrasts it with 'religions of authority'. Its basic postulate is the Kingdom of God; and a kingdom implies authority". The precepts of Jesus are not indeed, a "law of commandments contained in ordinances" and yet they are "far from being mere broad generalities". They indicate, " in a dramatic picture of some actual situation the *quality* and *direction* of action which shall conform to the standard set by the divine *agape*". "The law of Christ" "is not a specialized code of regulations for a society with optional membership. It is based upon the revelation of the nature of the eternal God, and it affirms the principles upon which His world is built and which men ignore at their peril".

We very warmly commend this wise, lucid and illuminating book.

SYDNEY CAVE.

The Era of the Church Fathers. By HANS LIETZMANN. Trans. B. Lee Woolf. 212 pp. Lutterworth. 18s.

This is the fourth and last volume of Hans Lietzmann's History of the Early Church, a work originally planned in five volumes, but left incomplete by the author's death. Much as we regret the incompletion, each volume has its own unity and in this one we have a masterly survey of the fourth Christian century. The style is vivid and clear, proportion is good and judgment is sound. The great characters of the century receive balanced treatment, and we receive added insight into the tensions between Ambrose and Theodosius, and Arius and Athanasius. Perhaps the best section of the

book is that on monasticism, a subject of continual fascination, and here set out both with logical analysis and with interesting detail.

The author is almost everywhere completely trustworthy; but *ousia* must not be rendered "nature" (p. 15). *Ousia* is "essence", and we make the sufficient confusion of the metaphysical disputes that much more confounded if we are not very careful with our terms. If the exact number of days needs to be given on page 139 it should be given correctly as five, not four.

The translator has done his exacting work well, though there are a few places where the punctuation is irregular and there is a very clumsy sentence at the top of page 115. And I must enter a protest against mixed forms in transliteration: Nectarius or Nektarios, but not Nektarius; Ptolemaeus or Ptolemaios, but not Ptolemaeos; and many more of a similar kind. Forms should be Latin *or* Greek—they should not be hybrids. A. R. VINE.

The Seal of the Spirit. By G. W. H. LAMPE. 340 pp. Longmans. 35s.

Free Church theologians may excel in certain fields, but we must concede admiration to those of our Anglican brethren who apply such assiduous scholarship to the early centuries. This work, displaying painstaking erudition, examines with minute care the relationship in the early centuries between Baptism, Confirmation and the Seal of the Spirit. Regarded merely as a work of scholarship this is a most excellent piece of writing: logically arranged, carefully written, precisely documented, tracing the whole matter from its far from clear sources in the New Testament, through the tangled paths of the early centuries, up to the emergence of the problem with fresh urgency today. Broadly I find myself in agreement with Mr. Lampe; and I hesitate to say more. For this book is a powerful contribution to one side in a theological contention within the Anglican Church, a contention which amazes Free Churchmen for its sincerity and intensity, which they feel unable to regard as a fundamentally vital issue yet which may have an almost decisive effect on future relationships between the Church of England and the Free Churches.

Whether it is a defect or a glory, Free Churchmen are not usually anxiously concerned over precision in rites. I do not know of any work by a Free Churchman setting out with theological precision the significance and interdependence of Baptism, reception into Church Membership, and the mode of reception of the Holy Spirit. We are deeply concerned about all these matters, but not in quite that way. We gladly accept all means of grace, yet attach little importance to the mechanism of the giving. If we are at fault in this, perhaps our excuse is that we are descended from those who revolted from a mechanism which had ceased to be a means of grace. Nevertheless, problems exist to be solved, and unwillingness to face them is not necessarily a sign either of courage or wisdom. Our Anglican friends are facing this problem: what is the relationship between Baptism and Confirmation, and when comes the Seal of the Spirit? The traditional Anglican view was that Baptism was the all-important rite, the Seal of the Spirit being given then or thereafter, and Confirmation was the acceptance by the person baptized of the vows made on his behalf when he was an infant. In recent times this view has been ably stated and defended by A. M. Ramsey, A. T. Wirgman, and Darwell Stone. But a school of thought has gathered progressive strength expounded by a succession, including F. W. Puller, A. J. Mason, Dom Gregory Dix, K. E. Kirk, and L. S. Thornton, which asserts that Confirmation, and that necessarily by a Bishop, is the essential Christian rite whereby the Spirit is given, and that Baptism is merely preparatory thereto.

I have stated the contrast as I see it, perhaps over simplified. But beneath that contrast I sense a yet deeper cleavage, the cleavage between the Good Samaritan and the Levite. The conflict is waged with an intensity we cannot wholly feel and with weapons with which our armoury is not well stocked. We therefore do well not to leap down into the arena. But we know for whom our thumbs would more gladly turn down.

Mr. Lampe says: "This doctrine that no person unconfirmed by a bishop can be possessed of the Holy Spirit, unless it be by some uncovenanted act of mercy, is flatly contrary to all experience". We may well pray that an increasing number of his brethren will be led to agree with him.

A. R. VINE.

The Mystics of Spain. By E. ALLISON PEERS. 130 pp. Allen & Unwin. 9s. 6d.

This little book is one of a series of "ethical and religious classics" the general editors of which declare that "the way of man's approach or return to God is in essence the same in Christian and in non-Christian teaching". This claim would certainly be substantiated if judgment were based on this book, for in all the passages from fifteen Spanish writers between 1300 and 1600 A.D. there is nothing so characteristically Christian as to distinguish it from Sufism or any other non-Christian writing on the religious life. The burden of almost every passage is the relation of the lover to the beloved, and the Song of Solomon rather than the New Testament is the Biblical source-book. Yet Professor Peers has done well to give us in translation these extracts from writers who with the exception of Ramon Lull, Loyola, St. Theresa and St. John of the Cross, are little known. To get the picture in proportion, however, the reader should pass on to John Mackay's *The Other Spanish Christ*. Spanish Protestantism has also had its mystics and saints.

A. VICTOR MURRAY.

In **The Destructorium Viciorum of Alexander Carpenter** (S.P.C.K., 5s.), an expanded university lecture, Prof. G. R. Owst provides a fifteenth-century sequel to his *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*. While primarily an encyclopaedic treatise on the Vices, the *Destructorium* is of interest as "one of the immediate fruits of an era of sacred eloquence" by a writer who, without becoming a Lollard, "belonged to a significant group of contemporary clerical agitators for ecclesiastical reform in this country".

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

Lancelot Andrewes. By FLORENCE HIGHAM. 128 pp. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

The Life and Works of Joseph Hall, 1574-1656. By T. F. KINLOCH. 210 pp. Staple Press. 21s.

Lancelot Andrewes, successively bishop of Chichester, Ely and Winchester, and his younger contemporary, Joseph Hall, successively bishop of Exeter and Norwich, make a curious contrast. Andrewes, "the founder of High Anglicanism", as a Roman Catholic writer has termed him, was an Arminian and a sacramentalist (though he did not approve of weekly celebrations, let alone daily). It was the younger man who represented the Church of England at the Synod of Dort and remained a firm Calvinist, and who denied the Corporal Presence in so many words. Andrewes, again, set the fashion for finding authority not only in Scripture but, with Rome, in the Fathers (though he then turned them against Rome); in "our English Seneca", as Fuller dubbed Hall, one feels the classics still predominant, or else the market-place. What Saintsbury says of Hall's style is true more generally: "at no time can he be said to share to the full the tendencies of his age". In their portraits Andrewes, like Laud, wears moustache and

pointed beard and looks troubled and introspective; Hall wears a spade beard, like Laud's predecessor, Abbot, and surveys the world solidly and imperturbably. Laud is the link between the two men. From Andrewes, "the great light of the Christian world", as he called him, Laud learned the theology and ritual which he sought to enforce; and at his trial he pled that he had taught and done no more than had Andrewes before him. Hall, *Puritanissimo,* as (with some exaggeration) the Pope's agent described him, Laud suspected and spied on; but "I preferred Bishop Hall to Exeter", he reminded his enemies at his trial. Laud also persuaded Hall to write in defence of *Episcopacy By Divine Right;* but, in Mr. Kinloch's judgment, "Hall was never completely ingenuous".

Dr. Higham has written an attractive book, slight but adequate for its purpose: adequate, since for Andrewes' theology she refers the reader to R. L. Ottley's study in the "Leaders of Religion" series; slight, since, as she admits, Andrewes "remains a shadowy figure, pre-eminently a teacher" and "a saint who knew himself to be a sinner". Andrewes' prayers, his *Preces Privatae,* provide the motive and glory of any biography of him. Some of us continue to feel, as Stoughton did, that the method and arrangement of these prayers are offensively formal and artificial; but in their *genre,* as "a glorious bejewelled patchwork of liturgical worship", they are not surpassed. Dr. Higham hardly succeeds in integrating Andrewes' devotion with his complaisance in ecclesiastical and court politics; but perhaps no one can. Ottley says that Andrewes' gentleness too often degenerated into weakness; Dean Church goes further and can explain Andrewes' "unworthy compliance" by nothing else than "superstition"; Dr. Higham is content to attribute it to his charity and singlemindedness. Certainly Andrewes was more at home in his study than in the world: "the solitary and contemplative life", he once said, "I hold the most blessed life. It is the life I would choose". That he could also be lacking in feeling appears from the occasion when he said this, for it was when examining the Separatist, Henry Barrow: "for close imprisonment", he told Barrow, "you are most happy". It is difficult to be sure that one really has Andrewes' measure.

Although Mr. Kinloch has lived with Hall for many years, he appears but little in sympathy with him. He writes of Hall's "wonted self-complacency" and says that Hall's "power of spiritual vision was but small": "Hall shows himself to be entirely destitute of imaginative insight and compassion". After disposing of Hall's life in an introductory chapter, in which the twenty years of Hall's episcopate are compressed into four pages, Mr. Kinloch presents analyses of Hall's writings, with copious extracts and occasional comments, e.g. on 'Hall's technique'—"he is a master of the sententious". There is no guide beyond the chapter-headings — Sermons, Contemplations, Meditations, Miscellany, Controversies, Literary Works — so that it is not easy to discover where any particular subject receives attention; and there is no study of Hall's writings as a whole and their relation to the thought of his time. At the end of the book a "List of Hall's Works" is printed with dates. It is not stated that these dates are those of the works' prefaces, not of their publication, and the list is not exhaustive. It does not include the three seventeenth-century editions of Hall's collected works, for instance. These Mr. Kinloch seems to have neglected in favour of the nineteenth-century editions by Pratt and Wynter; for most readers this is good enough, but in matters of detail Pratt does not always follow the original. Nor does Mr. Kinloch always follow Pratt. His use of inverted commas is cavalier, and his bibliographical references are sometimes incorrect or out

of date. He will nevertheless have achieved a useful purpose if he succeeds in arousing interest in a bishop who, like other conservative and common-sense figures in Church History, has received less attention than he deserves. The book may then be the forerunner of the critical biography which is needed. In this more use could well be made of Hall's pathetic account of his troubles at Norwich from the Puritan rabble, *Hard Measure* (1647), and some study be presented of the ordinations at Hall's hands in penal times.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

Antinomianism in English History: With special reference to the period 1640-1660. By GERTRUDE HUEHNS. 200 pp. Cresset Press. 15s.

Gorham and the Bishop of Exeter. By J. C. S. NIAS. 195 pp. S.P.C.K. 17s. 6d.

"The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (*Rom.* 8^2). Enthusiasm over new-found freedom in Christ has often led men to stress the last half of this pregnant saying at the expense of the first half; and to what its opponents called 'antinomianism' the religious excitement in England between 1640 and 1660 was peculiarly favourable. One cause (and effect) of antinomianism is a neglect of the Old Testament. Christians do well to *become,* in antinomian phrase, "emancipated, freed from that schoolmasterlike government and pedagogical whippings", but we dare not cut school out; the trouble with the antinomians, as George Fox remarked, was that they "had a convincement under the law, then start up to be as Gods; and never came *through* the Prophets, nor Moses' house". Yet antinomianism has this in its defence, that legalism has been a spoiler of piety from the Apostolic Fathers onwards. Will not true Christians do their duty, not because they ought, but because they want to? Will not pressing them to duty "make them Dutie-mongers, as if that Christ had not done all for them"? "Whom he called, them he also justified" (*Rom.* 8^{30}). In days when calling, grace and predestination were treated seriously, this text was taken by antinomians to mean that we are justified before, and thus without reference to, our baptism, faith or holiness.

These and other aspects of antinomianism invite careful study and may well be illustrated from the years 1640-60. Unhappily Dr. Huehns' book, though a Ph.D. thesis and well documented, is not a careful study. It is careless in detail (Naylor, Thurlow, John Abbott for George Abbot, John Newton for Isaac, *etc.*) and unreliable bibliographically: to say, e.g., that no tract opposing antinomianism after 1650 introduces a new name or idea is to neglect the work which gave antinomianism its quietus for half a century, Baxter's *Apology* (1654); while the genealogical table of sects printed without comment at the front of the book as "Tabelle des Honorius Reggius", with a reference to Gottfried Arnold's *Kirchen-u. Ketzer-Historie* (1669)—a slip for 1699—is printed wrongly at a salient point and was taken by Arnold from a work by Georgius Hornius, for which "Honorius Reggius" is no more than an anagram. Despite the fact that this table shows *Antinomi* as stemming from *Congregationales* (a derivation which is supported by Baxter), Dr. Huehns rarely regards the sectarian affiliations of the antinomian authors from whom she quotes; indeed she quotes in one breath from a pious Anglican incumbent such as Crisp or Eaton and from a Ranter such as Clarkson or Salmon. She worked under the late H. J. Laski and intended primarily a study in the relation of antinomianism to social and political history. To attempt this without first unravelling its theological and ecclesiastical strands was unwise. She is better, however, at broad judgments than at distinctions; and she has provided a great

number of thought-provoking contemporary passages which are of value even when her use of them is at fault.

In his study of the Gorham controversy, the Rector of Blandford St. Mary picks up the story at a point two hundred years later where it touches on baptism. He defines the issue thus: "Gorham believes in justification by faith and that Baptism, provided justification has preceded it, confers a measure of sanctification; the Bishop of Exeter on the other hand believes in justification and sanctification by Baptism". He gives a detailed account of the *cause célèbre* before the Court of Arches and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—"it is a stupendous issue", wrote Gladstone to Manning—and of its reverberations, including the secession to Rome of Manning and others. Among the contemporary pieces from which he quotes is one which provides "a brief interlude in the midst of the arid technicalities of the controversy". This is an anonymous Dissenting work, full of sardonic humour, in which "the writer clearly enjoyed making fun of the curious predicament in which the established church found itself". Mr. Nias writes as a parish priest who is concerned about that church's continuing predicament in the practice of indiscriminate baptism. "The problem of determining the proper regulation of the administration of Baptism today is precisely the problem of discovering the extent to which the nation is still Christian, and how far the Church of England in truth remains the National Church".

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

The Development of English Theology in the later nineteenth century. By L. E. ELLIOTT-BINNS. 137 pp. Longmans. 8s. 6d.

This book consists of the Burroughs Lectures for 1950 delivered in the University of Leeds; and Dr. Elliott-Binns consented after some hesitation to attempt the subject allotted to him, and to give so far as was possible in six lectures a continuation of Canon V. F. Storr's massive volume "The Development of English theology in the Nineteenth Century", which ended at 1860. The attempt was well worth making, because no part of the history of doctrine which should guide our constructive thinking needs such careful and judicious reflection as the history of the last 150 years. The characteristic of these lectures is their competence; and in between surveys of the position at 1860 and 1900, Dr. Elliott-Binns gives a judicial appraisal of the impact of science and philosophy, the impact of historical studies, and the state of Biblical and Dogmatic theology. As an introduction to English theology of the period it is excellent. It tends to be a little static, but it would have been difficult without more space to give an adequate understanding of the flow of discussion. There is no index; and this perhaps represents the author's judgment on his own work. It is an excellent sketch plan which whets the appetite for a more definitive treatment in which the author's generalizations can be tested out against an adequate presentation of detail. But within its own limits it is very well done.

H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

A History of the Cure of Souls. By JOHN T. MCNEILL. 371 pp. S.C.M. 25s.

Dr. McNeill, who is professor of Church History at Union Theological Seminary, New York, brings together into this book the product of over thirty years specialized reading in a subject which he has made particularly his own, and provides a unique survey of the cure of souls through the ages. He does not limit his review to pastoral care in its narrower sense but includes Church discipline, the application of "censures", the confessional and spiritual "direction", and the principle recovered by the Reformation of mutual responsibility among Church members for one

another's welfare of body and soul. The first three chapters deal with Jewish, Greek and Oriental religions, then come eleven full chapters which trace pastoral care from New Testament times through the various ages and different branches of the Christian Church. There is a final chapter which briefly sets pastoral care over against modern psychiatry and shows how they should be integrated. The great value of the book lies in the guidance it gives to the pastor of today from the advice and experience of the past and the way it drives the reader to want to pursue the available literature.

W. Gordon Robinson.

Church and Chapel. By R. A. Edwards. Eyre and Spottiswode. 8s. 6d.

Canon Edwards expands his title with the phrase "a study of the problem of Reunion in the light of history". His main contention is that any attempts by episcopal and non-episcopal bodies to reach reunion by discussing regularity and validity of orders, etc., will lead either to frustration or such disastrous experiments as the Church of South India. The alternative he proposes, at least for English Christianity, is that we should re-examine the Reformation so as to understand what happened then, and see what logic our research might have for the problem of Reunion. The suggestion is made in all good faith and charity; but Canon Edwards' ignorance of the Reformers gives their present-day sons much misgiving. "What produced the Reformation was not theology, but distressing facts" (p. 119). The Reformers were justifiably horrified at the medieval Church, and their protest apparently forgivable; but on the basis of this appeal to historical evidence, this question is to be addressed to those who left the Anglican Communion: "if they cannot now see in Anglicanism, as it has emerged from the tribulations of the past, the Church which their forefathers longed to discover" (p. 126). Canon Edwards thinks that along such a road there might be hope.

All this is a fair sample of the whole book, a set of four lectures: the idea of the Church, the Church of England, Nonconformity, the present situation. There are shrewd points, a somewhat gossipy style, woeful ignorance of what is not Anglican, an incurable conviction that the Anglican Church is all that may well be demanded of any Church, superficial scholarship, and a manifestly charitable spirit.

John Huxtable.

The Free Churches and Episcopacy. By E. A. Payne. 14 pp. Carey Kingsgate Press. 9d.

This pamphlet, packed full of relevant matter, is in no way meant to be an answer to Canon Edwards' *Church and Chapel.* But it does make clear what Canon Edwards fails to see: that Free Churchmen do not remain outside the Establishment because of loyalty to a history which has long since ceased to be relevant, but because they still are persuaded that the Church should not be subject in its spiritual mission to control by the State, should not be led by those whose authority is magisterial as opposed to ministerial, and should not restrict the valid exercise of any of the means of grace to a priestly caste. Dr. Payne, one of our most competent Free Church historians, here deals trenchantly with the particular question of episcopacy. He makes the necessary distinctions, and seeks to show that episcopacy, "in the ordinary modern sense of the word", is neither well-based biblically, sound theologically, nor happily endorsed by the verdict of history. He cites his authorities, and argues his case convincingly. We note with regret that two Greek words on pages 5 and 13, have received initial acute accents instead of smooth breathings; but this will probably not worry many of us.

A. R. Vine.

RELIGION

LIFE AND WORK

The Reality of Heaven. By GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL. 95 pp. Independent Press. 6s.

Here many strands are interwoven, interwoven with such skill and sensitiveness that it is difficult to decide whether one has been persuaded or captured. Dr. Nuttall is historian, philosopher and theologian, and he has marshalled his knowledge as it relates to that most poignantly urgent of all themes: is there an afterwards, or does death claim hope and love as well as the body? Yet this is no mere reasoned argument for immortality. Seven strands are shown, and they are presented for what they are—hopes against fears, the heart even against reason. The Biblical evidence is not made to carry more weight than it can bear; its proof is not in cold analysis, but in the warm and vital confidence that characterized those first disciples: "The Lord is risen indeed"! But through it all there flows that which gives this little book its real value: a deep personal experience enriched by a sensitive perception. There is a blending of careful scholarship, spiritual awareness and even mystical perception which gives it weight out of proportion to its size. It will carry conviction and bring comfort where neither a learned treatise nor a devotional essay would do so. We warmly commend it, and quote the lovely lines with which it closes: "This Shepherd seeks until He finds. And when he has found the sheep He seeks He puts it on His shoulders, rejoicing, and comes home. And home is heaven". A. R. VINE.

The Story of Christianity. By JOHN ARMOUR. 399 pp. Williams and Norgate. 25s.

This is meant to be a popular presentation of the general course of the history of Christianity. It would be difficult to accomplish such a work without being open to criticism here and there; but it is fair to say that Mr. Armour has accomplished his task very commendably indeed. He has a good sense of proportion, summarizes skilfully, avoids mere cataloguing, and has a pleasantly easy style. The book can be read with general confidence, and there are few errors to which attention need be called. But Robert Browne should not be spelled Brown (p. 248); Separatism did not come into being in 1662, but nearly 100 years earlier (p. 251); an entirely wrong impression is given as to the meaning of the Immaculate Conception by the omission, surely accidental, of the word "been" in the thirteenth line on page 292; the point is whether "she had been conceived without sin"; almost all Christians have accepted that "she had conceived without sin". Servetus died in 1553, not 1533 (p. 301). These are not serious matters, however, for it would be unreasonable to expect no slips in a summary of two thousand years of history.

The last few chapters deal with present day problems and with speculation as to the future. Here there may be more room for differences of opinion; but Mr. Armour helps us to consider the problems even if we do not accept all his solutions. A. R. VINE.

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Religions. By ROYSTON PIKE. 406 pp. Allen and Unwin. 30s.

Even in four hundred large double-columned pages it is somewhat optimistic to hope for anything approaching adequate treatment of the

world's religions. This work has admirably succeeded in that intimidating task. It would be difficult to find, even unreasonable to expect, a better handling of so wide a theme in equal compass. The work is arranged alphabetically, and we do not look in vain for any item we may reasonably expect to find in relation either to Christianity or to the other great religions of the world. Such a work can be tested in two ways. We may see whether it contains a number of test entries we think it should contain. It comes well through such a test: we do not look in vain for Anathema, Animism, Baxter, Bel, Shiites, Skoptsi, Vishnu or Zwingli. We may then test it on selected entries that we are competent to judge. Here again the author comes out well. I have found no errors of consequence, for it would be captious to complain if some very technical matters are not quite precisely expressed. Mr. Pike has done an excellent piece of work, which will be of great service to those needing a reliable source of information on the main aspects of Christianity and other religions. He would spend much more than 30s. to obtain equivalent information in any other way. A. R. VINE.

The Principles and Practice of the Christian Faith. By W. NORMAN PITTENGER. 180 pp. S.C.M. 9s. 6d.

Defining Christianity as a three-fold way—a way of believing about Reality, a way of adoring Reality, and a way of living which results from that belief and that adoration—or as he puts it elsewhere in the book, "an organic tradition, articulated in three ways—as doctrine or creed; as worship or cult; and as a way of life or code", the author, who is professor of Christian Apologetics in General Theological Seminary, New York, presents a simplified outline of systematic theology designed for students in colleges and those who have recently left college and are in business or the professions. It is attractively written, drawing upon a wealth of quotation and illustration (much of it from modern writers) and for the most part addressed personally to the reader. Its fourteen chapters with their useful sub-headings within each chapter cover most of the ground and do not ignore modern difficulties, and there is a bibliography to lead the reader into further study. The author is a member of the Anglican communion and writes as such, though the book is of real value to non-Anglicans also. Congregationalists will probably not agree with Dr. Pettinger in some things which he says about the Sacraments or the Creeds (where he himself seems to be somewhat uneasy) and on "Catholicism", but all should be grateful for this revised English edition of a book which has gone through several editions in the United States. W. GORDON ROBINSON.

The Ten Commandments: A Theological Exposition. By COSSLETT QUIN. 272 pp. Lutterworth. 15s.

In face of objections that prohibitions, as a way of making people good, are psychologically out-moded, that the Decalogue hardly applies to modern conditions, and that anyway the Gospel delivers us from bondage to the Law, Mr. Quin shows how grace must find expression in moral activity and love issue in obedience which fulfils law.

His exposition follows the scriptural direction—from God to the world; its key is "the threefold use of the law". Each commandment is treated in turn: as it appears in the Old Testament; as Jesus sharpened and spiritualized it in the Sermon on the Mount; and as the Apostles "often sprinkle and sometimes close their epistles" with moral exhortation. If law precedes grace in the Old Testament, in the New it "comes after grace and out of grace".

Vigorous in style and provocative of thought, the work reveals the possibility of preaching the commandments evangelically. The presentation of the theme is suited to preachers, and ought most certainly to be read and studied by them. CONRAD BONIFAZI.

Personal Peace and Power. By GORDON POWELL. 177 pp. Oxford University Press, Melbourne. Cumberlege. 9s. 6d.

The minister of the Independent Church, Collins Street, Melbourne, in a book of intense practicality and homely illustration, presents an account of the ministry of mental and spiritual healing in which he has had proof of the results to be achieved in personal peace and power when elements of psychology are combined with positive truths of the Christian faith. His work is unreservedly commended in a foreword by Dr. Leslie Weatherhead.

After describing 'Barriers to Peace and Power', 'Paths to Peace' and 'Channels of Power', the fourth part, comprising almost half the book, records what is called 'The New Technique'.

On the understanding that fears and hatreds and other 'spiritual germs' maintain a hidden warfare in the unconscious mind, but can be expelled by conscious and constant preoccupation with things pure, the technique is to distribute at Church Services 'Prayer Reminder Cards' containing a brief affirmative prayer and a summary of the message delivered. Prominently displayed at work or in the home they catch the eye; their spiritual affirmation infiltrates the unconscious; and life begins to respond to the working of Divine Grace. Results achieved in the widespread use of this technique certainly demand the attention of all who undertake the cure of souls. CONRAD BONIFAZI.

The Paschal Mystery. By LOUIS BOUYER, trans. by Sister Mary Benoit. 347 pp. Allen & Unwin. 18s.

This is a devotional work consisting of "Meditations on the Last Three Days of Holy Week" by the Professor of Spiritual Theology at the Institut Catholique de Paris. It is written by a Roman Catholic for Roman Catholics. It may be studied also with much profit by those of the Reformed persuasion. Here they will realize, for the first time or afresh, how deep runs the spiritual life of many Roman Catholics, what the Mass means as a whole and in its parts to those familiar with it, in how evangelical a sense the Mass may be interpreted, and the proper sense in which it may be called the Christian 'mystery'. The thoughtful reader may learn about the Gospel here as well as about the Roman Catholics. "The Last Supper taken by Christ with His disciples has had a two-fold effect: a real action accomplished once for all; a ritual action ever renewable. The mystery is that the two are only one". The sacramental principle the author expresses thus: "God takes us as He has made us. It is the nature of beings such as we are to be immersed in the sensible world and to communicate with another only through this world as medium. The world is, between God and us, the fundamental intermediary. . . . If signs are for us the only way of entering into the world of the spirit, it is because the mind itself wakens from the world only by a higher interpretation of earthly experiences". Is that very different from what John Oman said in "the Natural and the Supernatural"? The Christian "mystery", says this writer, is related to the pagan "mysteries", because "the religion of the Word Incarnate rests upon a religious symbolism stemming from the very origins of humanity and sharing its nature". We discuss the fading of the expectation of the speedy Return of Christ as if it were primarily a theological problem; but as a personal problem did it go with a fading

of the eagerness and expectancy of faith? The early Christians had an evening observance: "they always began this observance in the conviction that the Lord was going to appear with the first rays of morning; and the miracle is that this expectation, ever renewed, was never disappointed". It was the mystery of His presence at the sacred meal that alone makes this intelligible. This is indeed a book that Protestants well may ponder.

N. MICKLEM.

What St. Paul Said. By J. W. C. WAND. 108 pp. O.U.P. 7s. 6d.

This booklet contains four lectures given to L.C.C. Teachers. A brief introduction on the background is followed by an account of the letters that is something between summary and paraphrase, with some explanation of the circumstances which occasioned them. A final chapter summarizes Paul's teaching with great lucidity, though with some needless repetition.

The book admirably serves the purpose of teachers. But the following criticisms may be offered. The paraphrase of Gal. iii skates too quickly over the difficult verses 13 and 19; and that of Romans misses the significance of Paul's assertion that a divine righteousness is being offered to men, in view of their patent moral failure. On disputed points the author inclines to conservative opinions, e.g. on the genuineness of *Ephesians* and the *Pastorals;* and on Rome not Ephesus as the place of composition of the imprisonment epistles.

E. C. BLACKMAN.

Light in Darkness. A Book of Daily Readings. Compiled by HELEN OLNEY. 392 pp. Allen & Unwin. 7s. 6d.

The material of this book was written and compiled during the years of the war in the hope that it would help many withstand the acid tests of peace. Wide in range, the subjects appear in alphabetical order through the year, beginning with Action, Adversity and Anxiety during the first month, and ending with War, Wisdom and Workers in the last.

Each day begins with a word from the Scriptures, and the thoughts arising out of this are followed by an excerpt of poetry and a brief prayer. These daily sections are blended into one whole, and bring many of the affirmations of the Christian faith to bear upon the complexity of human life in our time. The book contains the distilled essence of a great religious experience which is often set forth with an originality and freshness that compel attention.

CONRAD BONIFAZI.

Y Ddau Gleddyf. By PENNAR DAVIES. 80 pp. Hugh Evans & Sons (Liverpool). 4s.

Welsh readers who want a brief preliminary survey of the relations between Church and State from N.T. times to the present day will find that Dr. Davies offers them a most useful guide. A slim work of this nature constitutes a small canvas for such an extensive subject and the author has had little opportunity for amplification, let alone for colourful elaboration, so we are left with a sober and economical sketch which is fair in the scholarly rather than the aesthetic sense. But the information which has been compressed into a limited space is all relevant to the matter in hand, and the serious student's appetite for more knowledge ought to be whetted, especially in view of the long bibliography of primary sources.

The final chapter ('Critical Remarks') naturally forms the most interesting section of the book. Dr. Pennar Davies is a radically yet pacifically minded Welsh Congregationalist. He has little to say in favour of a State-Church, with its constant danger of Erastianism, or of a Church-State as it has been realized in the past with its over-reliance on the secular sword. The coercive measures of the State show that it has been corrupted

by sin, and the Christian conscience cannot condone what is sinful. But as a means of promoting community between men the State represents a God-given principle, and it is part of a Christian's duty to help in perfecting such a valuable instrument. The author views with disfavour those pious Protestants who believe in a complete divorce between religion and politics. It is no part of true piety to be socially irresponsible. If Christ is Lord He is great enough to be the Lord of all life.

IORWERTH JONES.

Noel Buxton, A Life. By MOSA ANDERSON. George Allen and Unwin. 16s.

This stimulating study of a Christian in the political arena is a refreshing change from the biography full of Christian names and "intimate glimpses". Its strength is in the straightforward and workmanlike way in which we are told of Noel Buxton's endeavours to serve God in the service of his fellow men. He was in the high liberal tradition of the Norfolk Buxtons, Frys, Barclays and Hoares and carried into our own day the crusading spirit of his forebears. Possibly the most valuable chapters of the book are those dealing with the tangled skein of the Balkans and Buxton's immense services in the prolonged attempts to unravel it. This work of Buxton's in which he very nearly lost his life should be his real monument, yet oddly enough he is more likely in this country to be remembered as the creator of the County Agricultural Wages Boards.

A Golden Legend of the Slums. By DESMOND MORSE-BOYCOTT. Skeffingtons. 18s.

We may not share either the theology or the ecclesiastical polity of the author, but we admire the devotion of Anglo-Catholics (as of others) in slum parishes. These easily-read sketches are concerned with the author's ministry which for long was exercised in the dreary streets behind Euston Station. His later work with the choir school he founded is also dealt with at length.

F. M. HODGESS ROPER.

Disciples of All Nations: The Story of Christian Expansion. By BASIL MATTHEWS. 294 pp. O.U.P. 12s. 6d.

To compress the story of Christian expansion into less than 300 pages and still be readable is a considerable feat. In this posthumously published volume Basil Matthews has succeeded by that skilful combination of vivid miniature sketches of great personalities and a broad historical sweep of which he was a master. His quest for the picturesque word sometimes betrays him, e.g. "Anyone . . . will catch a glimpse of the bugle call . . ." (p. 191); and in the more crowded epochs the impression of a catalogue could hardly be avoided. There has long been a need for a compression of Latourette's monumental work, and this book should be most useful to teachers in the upper forms of secondary schools and to leaders of youth groups who wish to show the great sweep of Christian expansion from the first century to its world-wide expression to-day. There are attractive and clear maps, a bibliography, a table of dates and an index.

R. K. ORCHARD.

The Glory of the Sons: A History of Eltham College, School for the Sons of Missionaries. Editor, CLIFFORD WITTING. 292 pp. Published for the Board of Governors. 25s.

The story of the School for the Sons of Missionaries is a remarkable one and worthy of a full record. This volume, projected in connection with its centenary in 1942, carries the story down to 1950. Roughly half the

book is devoted to the history of the school, written by T. Cocker Brown, an old boy of the school and former foreign Secretary of the L.M.S. The present headmaster, G. Turberville, contributes an epilogue "Facing the Future", though he does not venture into the realm of prophecy. E. Rowlands, formerly with the L.M.S. in China, writes on "The Voyage Back", giving some account of the experience of old boys of the school who followed their fathers into the mission field. There are reminiscences by thirteen old boys and two masters, a history of the old boys' association, appendices giving a wealth of detailed information about various aspects of school life and a comprehensive index. The book is illustrated with photographs and sketches.

The book will naturally be of most interest to old boys, but it has much material which will be of use to those concerned with the missionary enterprise and with Christian education. Perhaps more can be learned on this latter subject from a discerning reading of this detailed story of one school with a specifically Christian foundation and purpose than from many more general surveys or theoretical discussions. The reflections to which it gave rise in the reviewer's mind concerning recent tendencies in the educational system of this country are not all reassuring. It is perhaps a pity that rather more space was not devoted to the place of the school and its old boys in the missionary outreach of the Church, interpreted in the widest sense. R. K. ORCHARD.

From the Independent Press come three more excellent books of Children's Addresses: *Doing the Impossible,* by H. W. Hitchcock (3s. 6d.); *The Armour of Light,* by Ralph Byers (3s. 6d.); and *A Million Miles to Nowhere,* by J. B. Wilson (3s.). The attractive appearance of the books, bright and modern, is well matched by their contents: and the prices are astonishingly reasonable.

The National Adult School Union Study Handbook for 1952 is entitled *Living in Families* (Paper 3s., Cloth 4s.). It is rich in matter introduced by competent persons. It opens up discussions on parenthood, work, the family purse, homemaking, music, leisure, gardens. A group of intelligent folk of any age will enjoy getting their teeth into these topics. Of particular value are the suggested approaches to some of the topics through poetry, plays, novels, essays and even painting.

The S.C.M. Press publishes a first book of sermons by Dr. H. E. Fosdick's successor, Robert J. McCracken, *Questions People Ask* (9s. 6d.). There are twenty-one of these questions ranging all the way from "Why did Jesus die?" to "Is there an art to living in New York City?" The Preface disclaims any intention of making the sermons doctrinal or biblical. Yet they are both in essence, and vitally interesting, well fulfilling the striking claim to be "life-situation preaching". Praise is due to the printer and binder for dressing a fine book so worthily.

Those into whose hands there came Dr. Hugh Martin's *The Lord's Prayer* will hasten to secure his further book of Bible-study *The Beatitudes* (S.C.M. 5s., paper). His treatment is clear and careful, but its full harvest will only be gathered by those who will read and re-read, who will ponder, and follow up the suggestions for wider reading to be found on almost every page. They may then debate some of the interpretations and may be in a position to elaborate some of the studies; but all the time they will acknowledge a debt to a wise and gracious teacher.

When the reading of a book makes one exclaim aloud in joyful agreement in a railway carriage full of folk, then it must say something to the reader in a forceful fashion. That was the effect of J. B. Phillips's *Your*

God Is Too Small (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.). The first half of the book is an exposure, in 55 pages, of inadequate conceptions of God. It is a penetrating analysis. The second half of the book would open the reader's eyes to the true God, "focused" in Jesus Christ. It is a strikingly helpful approach to the Incarnation. Quiet and persuasive, this is a book for thoughtful seekers. A solitary criticism would be that the writer leans too heavily on the precise wording of sayings quoted from the Fourth Gospel.

It is to be hoped that Dr. Kathleen Bliss's *The Service and Status of Women in the Christian Churches* (S.C.M., 12s. 6d.), will prove a deeply disturbing book. It may be misleading to learn that the book is an assessment of some fifty reports on the subject received in answer to an enquiry initiated by the World Council of Churches. It is neither so unoriginal nor so dull as that might well be. It is fresh, fascinating and challenging, dealing with the whole question of the rôle of women in modern society and in the Church in particular. We are asked to consider what a difference the coming of the welfare state must mean to women who form the majority of welfare workers; what it means that in many countries 30 per cent. of women are in economic employment; what are the implications of the fact that under the dire necessities of war women found new places of Christian leadership which they nobly filled; what is the real relevance of some apparently unfortunate Biblical texts. From a survey of the long and acrimonious debate about the place of women in the Churches we Congregationalists emerge with less dishonour than most. Yet we have far to go in practice, and we need this book as much as any. One correction of emphasis is essential. This book speaks of the Church's neglect of resources of personnel, meaning women. Do we use more than a tithe of the resources of personnel, meaning men? The largest question of all is surely, What does it mean to be a member of the Church today? The sex of the member is irrelevant.

The Book Adventurous by Phyllis Hall (Religious Education Press, 4s. 6d.) is not easy to classify. It consists of 12 imagined episodes such as may have occurred in the long story of the development of the O.T. It is not difficult, to take one example, to write such a dramatic account of the hiding or of the finding of Deuteronomy. It is not so easy to apply the same method to the Song of Deborah, the Book of Jashar, J. or E., or Ruth. Yet it is done and effectively done because behind all the author's imagination lies solid knowledge. That knowledge of fact is summed up in a short paragraph at the end of each chapter. At a guess the book is designed for the 13-15's. It should bring to life and make real what hitherto has seemed to them dull and dry.

Christian Vocation, by W. R. Forrester (Lutterworth Press, 12s. 6d.), asserts that the future of our way of life depends upon the level of production, in other words upon how hard we all work. But we live in an age and culture which apart from its branded enemy, Communism, has no clear conception of the place of work in life. Who can say what is work, or why or how men shall work, or whether men work to live or live to work? Will they only work for a profit motive or the same thing thinly disguised as incentives? And have we gained anything if the profit-motive is replaced by the power-motive? Professor W. R. Forrester believes that it is a matter of life and death that we find the right answers to these questions. He believes that there is no answer apart from religion, and that complete answers lie in the Christian conception of Vocation. His book falls into two parts. In Part I he discusses the three great emphases of Scripture: (a) a God-called nation, (b) God-called persons, (c) God-appointed "callings". He says of the latter, "It is this principle alone

which can enable us to deal redeemingly with the tragic errors of our time''. This Biblical view of vocation is applied in a discussion of morality, conscience, duty, ambition, pacifism and denominationalism, the key sentence being, ''What is the vocation of some need not necessarily be the duty of all''. Part II is mainly sociological and discusses the Greek and Hebrew idea of work, the N.T. idea, the idea of the Reformers, particularly of Calvin, and its outcome. So we are brought to face the challenge of Communism with its clear-cut doctrine. To that Professor Forrester would say as a Christian, ''Work is not merely a necessity for man, it is a privilege, a token of his kinship with the creator—God''. This is a rich book, timely, touching on manifold topics and full of fertile thoughts. Careful proof-reading has not eliminated errors. There are misprints on p. 74 1.2, 157 1.4, 166 1.8, and on p. 95 lines 6 and 7 from the bottom are in the wrong order! The two Indexes are models of their kind and add greatly to the usefulness of the book.

Story of Jesus (C.U.P., 1s. 3d.) is a 60 pp. selection of N.T. passages in the Basic Version arranged in five chapters. It was prepared for use in Africa: but it is certain of a welcome here. With an attractive paper cover and fine clear type, it makes that something more than a birthday card with which to greet child or adult.

Those who are concerned about evangelism today will do well to read *The Road to Dunfermline* by D. P. Thomson (West Fife Publishing Company, Paper, 2s.). It tells how the Evangelist of the Church of Scotland was called and trained and how he began to practise. Two more parts of the story are promised later.

The strong Anglican concern with preaching is expressed by the number of ''helps'' appearing in quick succession. *Thirty-six Outline Sermons for Country Parishes* by J. C. Anderson (Mowbray, Paper, 3s.) repays attention. The outlines are clear; the matter is simple; the illustrations are apt. All is so characteristically Anglican, sound teaching rather than great preaching.

The Promises of Jesus is a book of 20 addresses for Women's Meetings by the experienced William J. May. Here are simple devotional talks on great themes, full of interesting illustration and quotation. They could hardly be bettered.

When little ones beg, ''Read me a story'', or, growing a bit older ask, ''What shall I read?'' the answer to both needs can be found in *No Road Island* (Livingstone Press, 3s. 6d.). It is a book of jolly stories by Muriel Booth and of jolly drawings by Ingall, all about the West Indies. There are suggestions for a reading, a hymn and a prayer at the end of each story, making the book useful in home and school.

On the principle that we can learn from those from whom we differ, it is worth reading *Some Rare Virtues* by Raoul Plus, S.J. (Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 10s. 6d.). The virtues are eight, Gratitude, Recollection, Good Use of Time, Moderation, Facing Life, Fortitude in Suffering, Love of Reparation, Pity for the Afflicted. The aim is the hallowing of the stuff of daily living, but how differently Luther set about attaining the same object! Some of this is sound: some of it is nauseating.

A small book to be warmly commended is *Does Genesis Make Sense?* by Keith Chivers (S.P.C.K., Paper, 3s. 6d.). Here in 100 pp. is a brisk, scholarly and practical handling of that wonderful book. The sources are analysed; a brief running commentary is given; then comes a history of the book in the Church; and most valuable of all is a chapter on the eternal truths which Genesis teaches. The whole makes an excellent study book for an advanced class.

The Film Strip Guide (R.E.P., 6d.) gives sound advice on the use of Film Strips and an annotated list of material, prepared by a Committee of Youth Workers in the Free Churches. This small pamphlet is a mine of information on its subject.

The Mercy Seat (Salvationist Supplies Ltd., 9d.), is a 30 pp. pamphlet by W. R. Burrows on a characteristic piece of Salvation Army furniture which is the embodiment of an idea, a symbol of the meeting of sinner and Saviour. We are given a graphic study of conversion not without relevance for Congregationalists who read it in this third year of the Forward Movement.

Dr. W. R. Inge remains readable to the last. He himself declares that *The Faith of St. Paul* (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.) is probably his last lecture. It is never systematic but always suggestive, illuminated by the interests of a lifetime and marred by the antipathies. Of course, Plotinus is praised and Luther is damned; the Roman Catholic is pitied and automatic progress is castigated. How deeply we shall miss this far-ranging intellect, incisive comment and deeply spiritual faith, even though it all throws little light on Paul.

JOHN WILDING.

The Mystery of Love and Marriage. By D. S. BAILEY. 136 pp. S.C.M. 12s. 6d.

Here is a book to be studied and to be kept for reference purposes. It is a metaphysical interpretation of Henosis or the 'one flesh' concept, which is "a relation between an I and a Thou". This relation is the only true basis for marriage and for sexual intercourse. When it is achieved "The lovers communicate to each other a vision of God who is the End of their love and their life". Apart from this relationship "the beloved is known objectively, as she is—that is, one She among others", but the Thou is "seen no longer as part of that world in which evaluations and comparisons are made". From the beginning to the end the book is intellectually stimulating. It surveys historically, though briefly, the different points of view held by earlier and later Christian writers on marriage—its nature and purpose, its dissolution, also on the place of sex and the vexatious problem of remarriage. However, such a metaphysical approach to the mystery of love and marriage inevitably raises a two-fold problem: (1) For how long must a man or woman postpone marriage until a Thou is encountered? Bailey points out that there is no reason why the Thou should not be discovered after marriage if not before, but if his thesis is sound, should one take such a risk? (2) How is one to know that what appears to be a Thou is anything more than a reflection of an introjected image in the mind of the lover, e.g. the image of a much beloved parent? What the writer has to say about Eros, Philia, and Agape in marriage will meet with a warm response in every reader's mind, whether or not he agrees with the main thesis.

The Religion Behind the Religions. By G. RANDALL JONES. 42 pp. The Lindsey Press. 1s. 6d.

This little book is a sincere attempt to find a common religious denominator which will achieve world harmony. The author recommends a blending of the finest elements "of Christianity, Buddhism, and Hinduism, and the rest". Of the forms of Christianity, he advocates Unitarianism on the grounds of its three fundamental characteristics: Freedom, Reason, Tolerance. These provide a balanced attitude to other forms of Christianity, "and a consideration for the testimony of the great religions of the world".

Psychology and Religious Faith. By R. W. Wilde. 37 pp. The Lindsey Press. 1s. 6d.

Dr. Wilde makes a determined attack on all psychologists who have tried to explain away religion by their own respective theories. He does this by pointing out the fallacies in their arguments, and by using the well-known criticism that psychology must confine itself to what goes on within the mind, and not attempt to explain what is true or unreal outside it. One wishes the author had given more space to what psychology can do for religion, for his brief treatment of the false motives in religion is beneficial to those who have never suspected them. W. E. Sargent.

Science and the Christian Man. By Charles E. Raven. 60 pp. S.C.M. 4s 6d.

By way of encouragement (or of warning to fundamentalist and neo-orthodox), let it be said that those who have learned what to expect of Canon Raven will not be disappointed. His conviction that truth cannot be different for science and religion is here expressed in six broadcast talks, which interpret creation, by way of the evolutionary process, as culminating in man, distinguished from sub-human creatures in his self-consciousness, and reaching the highest manifestation of his personality in religious experience. This, not fully to be described, must be interpreted in terms of personal intercourse, which involves consideration of the unique status of Jesus, of the doctrine of the Trinity, and of the significance for Christianity of particular historical events, including miracles. The final talk on the Holy Spirit calls for reconsideration of the idea of "progress", and presents ideas of great practical importance for the work and witness of the Church today. E. H. Pyle.

The Cheshire Agreed Syllabus of Religious Instruction. 202 pp. University of London Press. 8s. 6d.

Agreed syllabuses multiply, and each tries to be different from its predecessors. This Cheshire syllabus shows a plain matter-of-factness. It is a practical handbook and is scarcely concerned at all with the principles underlying modern Bible study. It says, for instance, that there was a Deutero-Isaiah and a Trito-Isaiah, but gives no clue to justify these titles. The Church history section is somewhat breathless and rather markedly Anglican, and the bibliography is a catalogue with no guidance given for using it. It will, however, be a useful book in the class-room.

A. Victor Murray.

MISCELLANEA

The Wilderness Voyage. By PETER GRIEVE. 216 pp. Jonathan Cape. 15s.

Amazonia is the greatest unexplored area on earth. It is little better known today than it was 100 years ago when Bates wrote *The Naturalist on the Amazons.* Its 2½ million square miles of forest (an area nearly as great as that of the United States) is perhaps more sparsely populated than the Sahara, and it is only on the banks of the great river and its tributaries that life is possible at all. In this book Peter Grieve, a journalist and special correspondent who died in 1950 aged 43, describes a 2,500-mile journey in this region from Belém at the mouth of the Amazon to the cattle-town of Trinidad in eastern Bolivia. Except for an interlude of 230 miles on the fantastic Madeira-Mamoré railway, he travelled the whole distance in small wood-burning river steamers. The Amazon has inspired some of the finest pages in English travel literature, and this book, although it lacks the classic quality of Bates' *Naturalist* and the vividness of Tomlinson's *The Sea and the Jungle,* is worthy of its theme. Particularly memorable is the account of the 'lost' city of Manaos, relic of the Brazilian rubber boom, complete with a cathedral, tram-cars, even an opera house, rotting in the jungle, a thousand miles from anywhere. Religion in the fastnesses of Amazonia would seem to be a mixture of showmanship and superstition, and the church, with its illuminations, constant bell-ringing and firework displays, competes—apparently successfully—with the cinema.

P. A. SPALDING.

The Forging of a Family. By LORD GEDDES. 424 pp. Faber and Faber. 25s.

Lord Geddes's long book *The Forging of a Family* is the epitome of the thought and experience of a lifetime. Its sub-title explains its nature concisely: A Family Story studied in its Genetical, Cultural and Spiritual Aspects and a Testament of Personal Belief founded thereon. As this suggests, it is both more and less than the conventional autobiography which Lord Geddes's distinguished and varied career, together with his command of forthright, unambiguous English, would so well have qualified him to write. It is more, in that it studies his family history from its remote origins among the fourth-century Scots of Ulster, with ever-increasing detail, to the present day. It is less, because the author's own life as doctor, soldier, politician and businessman is sketched only in so far as it illustrates the principles evolved in his study of the family as a whole, and in no greater detail than the lives of his brothers and sisters. All were remarkable: one brother, Eric, was the Geddes of "Axe" fame; one sister, Mona Chalmers-Watson, was the first woman medical graduate of Edinburgh and founder and first Controller of the W.A.A.C. in World War I. This record, in spite of its shapeless and somewhat confusing structure, touches interestingly on many fields of experience. It is valuable if only for the writer's moving account of the gradual onset and effects of blindness, and for the expression of his simple belief in God and a final purpose, a belief based partly on his spiritual experiences while in the "thanatoid" state, the three occasions when, after an accident, he, or his body, was to all appearances dead.

P. A. SPALDING.

The Story of Language. By MARIO PEI. 493 pp. Allen and Unwin. 25s.

Though serious students of comparative philology may be few, most people are interested in discussions on the origin of language, on the similarities and differences between languages, on the problems of learning them, and in odd items of curious information to do with particular words and phrases.

Dr. Mario Pei, an American philologist of Italian origin, has succeeded in writing a fascinatingly interesting book which combines learned treatment and popular appeal in a remarkable manner. In a style that holds continuous attention, he deals with the evolution of language from signs, imitations and grunts; the origin and diversifying of the great language groups; how living languages are still changing; the problems in learning a language; and his hopes for the adoption in the not too distant future of a universal language. But this mere list conveys no impression of the wealth of detail illustrating the main themes, and the many delightful tit-bits of information. Did many of us know that Vatican Latin for motor-bicycle is "birota ignifero latice incita"—"two-wheeled vehicle driven by fire-bearing juice"? Or, to go to a far extreme, that Chinese pidgin English for bishop is "top side piecee Heaven pidgin man"? But this kind of thing does not involve the omission of necessary learned detail. The index has not failed to give references to every reasonable item, from Sanskrit to Grimm's Law and Hindi to Volapuk.

There are two copious indexes, occupying 30 pages. This is an excellent book in every way, and lest our commendation appear fulsome we will make one criticism: it would have been still better if it had been provided with a bibliography. A. R. VINE.

Thomas Mann: An Introduction to his Fiction. By HENRY HATFIELD. 176 pp. Peter Owen. 12s. 6d.

In a toast which he proposed to his fellow-novelist, Jakob Wassermann, at a meeting of the Goethe Society in Munich in 1927, Thomas Mann recalled the occasion on which, some thirty years earlier, Wassermann, then joint editor of *Simplicissimus,* paid him a fee for a short story. At that time *Buddenbrooks,* his first novel, had not been written; and during the half century which followed Mann, through amazing creativity and prodigious intellectual power, has become the most distinguished of contemporary novelists. Thanks to the fine translations by Mrs. Lowe-Porter nearly all his work has become available in English; little, however, has been written about him in English on this side of the Atlantic. There was a book on him by Mr. James Cleugh in 1933, but since then the great *Joseph* tetralogy, *Lotte in Weimar,* and *Dr. Faustus* have been written. Now the short but compact book on Mann by Mr. Hatfield, who lectures on German at Columbia University, is available, and as an introduction it is admirable, though limited. It will be a long time before Mann's great output is adequately dealt with; the English reader, however, who has some familiarity with some of Mann's novels as fiction will be helped by Mr. Hatfield's book to appreciate Mann's art and the ideas which underlie so much of it. Mr. Hatfield describes *The Magic Mountain* as "one of the most imposing structures erected by the modern mind", and so it is. So, too, is *Dr. Faustus.* Indeed, there is a consistent line of movement through all of Mann's works: his preoccupation among other things with the artistic consciousness, with decadence, with disease. For just as he described in 1900 the unpleasant death of Thomas Buddenbrook and Hanno's death from typhoid fever in *Buddenbrooks,* so does he tell us in 1948 about little Nepo Schneidewein's death from meningitis and the fatal insanity of Leverkühn in *Dr. Faustus.*

Mr. Hatfield's book does not bring out Mann's greatness, for a full study of his work would have to devote more space to the fine essay on Goethe and other subjects, as well as to the major novels; these are referred to in a note only. Indeed, the vast body of Mann's work cannot be adequately dealt with in a book of this compass; but within the limitations indicated the book should be regarded as a competent introduction, and it does not claim to be more. GERAINT V. JONES.

A Reader's Handbook to Proust. By P. A. SPALDING. 303 pp. Chatto and Windus. 10s. 6d.

That strange but fascinating Frenchman, Marcel Proust, left as his principal literary monument what is in effect a 12-volume novel, known in English as *Remembrance of Things Past*. The work can be divided into virtually separate books; but characters and ideas pass on from one book to another, and it is fair to warn a prospective reader to leave Proust alone or to be willing to plod steadily through over 4,000 pages. The fascination of Proust consists in his combination of the observation and novel-craft of a Meredith and the insight into human nature, particularly abnormal human nature, of a Freud.

But yielding to the spell and reading him does not bring emancipation. Proust gains disciples—or should we say addicts—and they wish to trace this trenchant saying or to get acquainted again with that character. To find some remark in 4,000 pages is rather a task, and to trace a character who comes on and off the stage during 12 volumes is not easy. Various helpful handbooks have been published in France, and now Mr. Spalding has rendered a similar service for the English reader. His handbook is really excellent of its kind. Its main sections are: a synopsis of the whole work, sufficiently detailed to enable the new reader to know what to expect and to bring the shape of the whole work before an old reader; a complete index of characters, enabling all relevant references to any particular character to be traced; a general index of topics, which will help in the tracing of aphorisms and obiter dicta; a chronology of Proust's life and work; and a short but highly competent excursus into Proust's sources.

Mr. Spalding has laid all English devotees of Proust under great indebtedness to himself. A work of this kind could not have been better done. A. R. VINE.

Philosophers Lead Sheltered Lives. By JAMES K. FEIBLEMAN. 321 pp. Allen & Unwin. 25s.

This exercise in autobiography tells the story of a middle-aged American whose earliest ambition was to become a poet, but who was prevented from doing so by various accidents of station, fortune and health. Mr. Feibleman's health prevented him from finishing his college career, and his father's business demanded some years of his time and consideration. Meanwhile he became interested in philosophy, and this book tells the story of his pilgrimage. There is much that is interesting and amusing, but I wish I could give a book by an amateur philosopher more endorsement than I think it warrants, for the professional philosophers have in these latter days made rather a mess of what was for some of us as we first read philosophy a very great tradition of human thinking. Mr. Feibleman's work is spoilt by his own weaknesses. He despises 'reporters', but there still clings to his own writing too much of the journalist's flair for dismissing something you don't like with a smart 'crack'! If only Mr. Feibleman had preserved something of the sensitive insight of the true poet, or the calm judgment of the true philosopher, if he had been content to write simply of wisdom rather than to score brightly off his opponents, we might have had a great

book. Mr. Feibleman protests against 'realism' in literature, but is 'realistic' about some at least of his own 'wild oats'. As a philosopher his sheltered life has been that of a son of a prosperous American businessman, who was able to indulge many of his desires, the more so as he was by no means the normal strong boy, and his parents were therefore more disposed to treat him leniently. But perhaps the weakest element in the book is that Mr. Feibleman seems not to have reckoned seriously enough with the possibility that there are some things against which no shelter of fortune or human favour can prevail—I mean those enemies of the true poet and philosophic spirit, enemies that can infiltrate quietly into the quietest of lives, and hinder the development of that serenity and harmony in which alone the roots of great philosophy are to be found. JOHN MARSH.

A Psychologist at Work. By E. GRAHAM HOWE. 179 pp. Faber. 8s. 6d.

This book comprises twenty-four articles already published in "Picture Post". It begins with the purpose of psychology, and then proceeds to deal with its application to human problems and situations. The author's style is journalistic, and at times conveys the impression that he is talking "at" his readers, an attitude he condemns in article twenty: "We none of us like being talked 'at', because it robs us of our self-respect". Dr. Howe has many useful suggestions to offer, but they might have been more helpful if the author had spent some time in presenting his ideas in a convincing manner. Instead he hurls them at his readers' minds like a boy hurling snowballs at a wall with the hope that they will stick. It is likely that no modern, thinking woman will allow his ideas on "Why are fathers out of fashion"? to stick in her mind. She will probably be antagonized by the inference that men are still the superior beings, and that the author doesn't think a great deal of his opposite sex. I am sure the author doesn't wish to convey false notions, but this is unavoidable unless a writer keeps before him the immediate reactions of his readers. If the reader can obtain a balance between what the author means, and his words, much profitable help may be gleaned. The forward by Tom Hopkinson is worth reading and pondering over. W. E. SARGENT.

ALSO RECEIVED

Christianity and the Reconciliation of the Nations, by C. H. Dodd. 29 pp. S.C.M. 3s. 6d. True Christianity should transcend sect and nationality. This has always been recognized, but seldom realized. Dr. Dodd shows both present relevance and present possibility.

Preaching in a Scientific Age, by E. C. Rust. 24 pp. Overdale College, Birmingham. 1s. 6d. A very competent statement of the way in which a less assured science and a more enlightened theology are becoming reconciled.

Alex Wood—the Man and his Message, by C. E. Raven. 20 pp. Fellowship of Reconciliation. 1s. 6d. A memorial lecture to a great Cambridge scientist and a great Christian.

Carl Heath, by F. J. Tritton. 32 pp. Friends Home Service Committee. 1s. 3d. The story of a great Quaker international.

The Hidden Life, extracts from the writings of Isaac Penington. Selected by Robert Davis. 40 pp. Friends Home Service Committee. 3s. Gracious insight from a 17th century Quaker.

The Church's Unity, a study outline. 20 pp. S.C.M. 6d.

A Study of Man-Woman Relationship, a study outline. S.C.M. 1s.

Readers' Guide to books on Religion. 64 pp. The Library Associaton. 10d. A very useful bibliography of theological and religious books, which would give the student useful preliminary guidance.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

International Review of Missions (April). 'Towards Willingen' by the Editor recounts the preparatory work done for the forthcoming conference there. Dr. G. Pilhofer writes on 'The Threat of Secularism to non-Europeans; Rev. F. C. Kamma on 'Messianic Movements in New Guinea'; Dr. John Baillie contributes a lecture on 'The World Mission of the Church', and the Rev. L. Constantine, an ex-China missionary, on 'The Gospel to Communists'. Dr. P. D. Devanandan writes on 'The Christian attitude to non-Christian religions'. Miss Eliz. A. Lee is interesting on 'School Evangelism in Latin America'. Reviews, Bibliography and Quarterly are excellent.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (April) has 'Aspects of the Medieval Idea of God' by Rev. A. John Badcock; 'Swine, Sound and Sanity' by Rev. H. Belshaw. Dr. Francis Glasson challenges 'Some current delusions in Apocalyptic'; Rev. Tom Dring begins a discussion of 'The World Family in History'; Rev. Cyril Davey writes on the international village of Pestalozzi.

Church Quarterly Review (Jan.-March). Dr. Erich Roth contributes the first part of an interpretation of 'Martin Luther and the Continental Reformation'; Rev. E. L. Mascall writes on the relation between the 'Eucharist and the Sacrifice of Christ'; Dr. H. E. W. Turner contributes his University sermon on 'The Organic and Covenant Ideas of the Church'; Mr. W. G. Addison writes on 'Academic Reform at Balliol, 1854-82'.

Evangelical Quarterly has 'Old Testament Study Today' by Prof. G. Ch. Aalders; 'The Bible and the last half-century of Archaeology' by Prin. P. W. Miller; 'Justification by Faith; the Old Testament Anticipation' by Rev. Leon Morris; 'The Doctrine of Justification by Faith in the Epistle to the Romans' by Prof. R. V. G. Tasker.

Baptist Quarterly (Jan.). The Rev. Herbert Clarkson begins a series of studies of 'The Holy Spirit'; Dr. Hugh Martin denies any true analogy between 'Baptism and Circumcision'; Mr. Maurice Hussey gives an interesting account of 'Bunyan's Map.'

Yale Review (Winter, 1952) is mainly political. 'The Future of the New Japan' by Mr. David K. Eichler; 'Wanted—Wiser Power Politics' by Prof. Wm. G. Carleton; 'The Idea of America' by Prof. Adrienne Koch; 'Communism in Western Europe' by Prof. Mario Einaudi are all noteworthy.

Huntingdon Library Quarterly (Feb.). 'The Old Cosmos: A Study in Elizabethan Science' by Prof. Paul H. Kocher; 'William Lambard's *Ephemeris*, 1580-1588' by Prof. Conyers Read; 'No Middle Flight' by Prof. Hallet Smith and ' ''That Two-Handed Engine'' once more' by Prof. Leon Howard are suggestive studies in *Paradise Lost* and *Lycidas* respectively. There are interesting notes on Dean Swift and Wordsworth.

Theology Today (Jan.). Prin. Cunliffe-Jones has a good article on 'Ought a Christian Man to be Afraid'. 'Faith and Freedom in Existentialism' by Prof. David E. Roberts is a study in Kierkegaard and Sartre. In 'Present Responsibility and Future Hope' Prof. Nels F. S. Ferré argues for a moral eschatology as the only foundation for ethics. Rev. Richard C. Smith's article on 'The Miner and the Church of Christ' is based upon experiences in the coalfields of Europe and America.

Review and Expositor (Jan.) has 'The Distinctiveness of the Church' by Prof. Theron D. Price; 'The Lordship of Jesus' by Rev. John M. Sykes; 'N.T. Textual Criticism in 19th Century' by Rev. Lyle O. Bristol; 'New Developments in N.T. Theology' by Prof. John Newport; ''Baptized for the Dead'' by Rev. A. G. Moseley.

New Outlook (New Year) has 'Types of Christian Drama' by Miss Dorothy L. Sayers; a striking study of 'Unfavourable Attitudes to Religion' among adolescents by Dr. G. Jahoda; 'English Christians and the New Asia' by Mr. Francis House; 'Faith and Society' by 'Dunstan'. The Editor appeals for support for this new venture in the literature of Christian humanism.

The Modern Free Churchman has 'Where we Stand' by Mr. Clifford Hall; 'Anti-Liberal Propaganda' by Rev. J. C. Hardwick.

The Congregational Historical Society (Secretary, The Rev. Charles Surman) invites new members and support for its *Transactions*.

J. M. PHILLIPS.